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I have often thought upon death, and find it the least of all evils. All that which is past is as a dream; and he that hopes or depends upon time coming, dreams waking.

Francis Bacon
An Essay of Death, Spedding, Works, VI, p. 600

We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

Shakespeare
The Tempest 4:1:156-158
CONTENTS

1. The Important Circumstances leading up to the Supposed Death of Francis Bacon on Easter Sunday 9 April 1626 p. 4

2. The Grand Illusion: His Final Drama p. 26

3. References p. 67
FACSIMILES

Fig. 1 An Engraving of the Bacon Monument at St Michael’s Church from the 1671 Resuscitatio p. 37

Fig. 2 ‘On Worthy Master Shake-speare’ from the 2nd Shakespeare Folio 1632 p. 46

Fig. 3 The title page of the 2nd Shakespeare Folio 1632 p. 49

Fig. 4 The frontispiece from Oeuvres Morales 1626 p. 51

Fig. 5 The frontispiece of Bacon’s La Saggesse Mysterieuse (The Wisdom of the Ancients) 1641 p. 52

Fig. 6 The frontispiece of Bacon’s The Advancement of Learning 1640 p. 54

Fig. 7 The title page of Bacon’s The Advancement of Learning 1640 p. 55

Fig. 8 The title page of The Fame and Confession 1652 p. 57

Fig. 9 The frontispiece to The History of the Royal Society 1667 p. 61

Fig. 10 Three portraits of Johann Valentin Andreae (with the last possibly Francis Bacon) p. 63

Fig. 11 A portrait of Francis Bacon as an old man p. 65
1.
THE IMPORTANT CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING UP TO THE SUPPOSED DEATH OF FRANCIS BACON ON EASTER SUNDAY 9 APRIL 1626

Fearing for my life lest King Charles should kill me, I feigned death, being put to sleep with opium. I was sewn in a sheet and taken to St Michael’s Church where I was found seventeen long hours later by Sir Thomas Meautys who brought me back to life by the injection of nightshade into my rectum. I escaped from England dressed as a serving maid of Lady Delaware.


As he moved into the final decade of his known life Francis Bacon anticipated that the running grievance of patents and monopolies were likely to dominate parliament. In February 1621 the patent for Gold and Silver thread whose profits had been divided between the king, the favourite Buckingham and his brother Sir Christopher Villiers was put under investigation which Bacon as referee became caught up in opening the door for his enemies principally led by his old adversary Sir Edward Coke to bring malicious allegations against him for corruption. He turned to James and Buckingham for protection. Instead the king to save Buckingham and the royal favourite to save himself sacrificed Bacon in one of the greatest political betrayals in all English history which has continued to unjustly damage his reputation in the eyes of posterity to the present day. On 3 May 1621 the House of Lords passed its severe sentence. He was dismissed from office as Lord Chancellor and banned from holding any other office of state or serving in parliament. He was fined the enormous sum of £40,000 and imprisonment at the king’s pleasure and forbidden to come within twelve miles of the verge of the court. He was taken to the Tower on 31 May but was released a few days later on 2 June and taken to the house of Sir John Vaughan at Parsons Green in Fulham for some rest and recuperation. A few days later on 6 June Bacon wrote a revelatory letter written to his trusted friend the Spanish Ambassador Count Gondomar in which he plainly states he would devote himself to the instruction of the actors and the service of mankind:

Your Excellency’s love towards me I have found ever warm and sincere alike in prosperity and adversity. For which I give you due thanks. But for myself, my age, my fortune, yea my Genius, to which I have hitherto done but scant justice, calls me now to retire from the stage of civil action and betake myself to letters, and to the instruction of the actors themselves, and the service of posterity.¹

In the last five years of his recorded life Bacon wrote, revised, expanded, translated and published an enormous body of his writings and works in Latin and English. This was carried out in his literary workshop at Gorhambury with the help of his ‘good pens’, among them his dear friend the metaphysical poet George Herbert who assisted him in translating De Augmentis Scientiarum and the poet and dramatist Ben Jonson, who assisted Bacon in translating his essays from English into Latin, which had been previously printed and published by John and William Jaggard who with his son Isaac Jaggard, printed and published the Shakespeare First Folio:
And, knowing that this Work [The Advancement of Learning] was desired beyond the Seas …he caus’d that part of it which he had written in English to be translated into the Latin Tongue by Mr. [George] Herbert, and some others, who were esteemed Masters in the Roman Eloquence.

…The Latine Translation of them [Bacon’s Essays] were a Work performed by divers Hands; by those of Doctor Hacket (late Bishop of Lichfield) Mr. Benjamin Johnson (the learned and judicious Poet) and some others, whose Names I once heard from Dr. Rawley; but I cannot now recall them.²

The De Augmentis Scientiarum translated by the metaphysical poet George Herbert and the Shakespeare First Folio jointly edited by Ben Jonson while they were living with Bacon at Gorhambury and both belonging to his Rosicrucian Brotherhood were published within days of each other in November or December 1623. The preliminary page of the First Folio consists of a verse signed by Ben Jonson facing the Droeshout portrait. The same poet and dramatist provides another long commendatory poem ‘To the memory of my beloved, The Author Mr. William Shakespeare’, whom Ben has known for many years to be nothing more than a pseudonym, or literary mask, for his Rosicrucian Grand Master, Lord Bacon. The learned address ‘To the great Variety of Readers’, signed by John Heminge and Henry Condell (both probably semi-illiterate), was most likely jointly written by Bacon alone and/or with Ben Jonson.

The Shakespeare First Folio with its Rosicrucian-Freemasonry imagery and symbols is dedicated by Bacon in the name of Heminge and Condell:

TO THE MOST NOBLE
AND
INCOMPARABLE PAIRE
OF BRETHREN.

WILLIAM
Earle of Pembroke, &c. Lord Chamberlaine to the
Kings most Excellent Maiesty.

AND

PHILIP
Earle of Montgomery, &c. Gentleman of his Maiesties
Bed-Chamber. Both Knights of the most Noble Order
of the Garter, and our singular good
LORDS.³

At the time of the publication of the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays its dedicatee William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, was secretly occupying Solomon’s Chair in his magnificent capacity as Grand Master of all England:

WILLIAM Earl of Pembroke was chosen Grand Master [1618]; and being approved by the King, he appointed Inigo Jones his Deputy Grand Master.

…Grand Master PEMBROKE demitted, A. D. 1630.⁴
In 1624 supported by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, Grand Master of England, his kinsman the metaphysical poet George Herbert was returned MP for Montgomery under the control of other incomparable brethren Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery and in the same year his Rosicrucian Master Bacon dedicated to him *The Translation of Certaine Psalmes into English Verse*:

TO HIS VERY GOOD FREND

M'. GEORGE HERBERT

The paines, that it pleased you to take, about some of my Writings, I cannot forget: which did put mee in minde, to dedicate to you, this poore Exercise of my sicknesse. Besides, it being my manner for Dedications, to choose those that I hold most fit for the Argument, I thought, that in respect of Diuinitie, and Poesie, met, (whereof the one is the Matter, the other the Stile of this little Writing) I could not make a better choice. So, with signification of my Loue and Acknowledgment, I euer rest

Your affectionate Frend,

FR. S'ALBAN.5

During this period in the last five years of Bacon’s recorded life his first editor and English biographer Dr Rawley who lived with him for the last decade of his life tells how his Rosicrucian master also put the finishing touches to his utopia *New Atlantis*.6 In his preface to *New Atlantis* he states that Bacon had devised the utopia in order to exhibit a model or description of a college which he called Solomon’s House for the interpreting of nature and producing of marvellous works for the benefit of mankind.7 The island of New Atlantis (the Land of the Rosicrucians) is governed by Rosicrucian Brothers who are in an advanced state of philosophical and scientific knowledge. In their college Solomon’s House (the central legend of the Freemasonry Brotherhood) they pursue researches in all the arts and sciences for the future benefit of humankind. *The New Atlantis* observes his knowing great editor Spedding is a reflection of Bacon himself:

Perhaps there is no single work of his which has so much of himself in it. The description of Solomon’s House is the description of the vision in which he lived,-the vision not of an ideal world released from the natural conditions to which ours is subject, but of our own world as it might be made if we did our duty by it; of a state of things which he believed would one day be actually seen upon this earth such as it is by men such as we are; and the coming of which he believed that his own labours were sensibly hastening.5

As Bacon, with the help of Dr Rawley, Ben Jonson and George Herbert continued to revise, enlarge and translate his works for publication, he was mindful that a change of monarch was on the horizon, with all its potential implications for the kingdom and for him personally. During the last year of his life the health of James I was steadily deteriorating and he was rarely able to visit London, while the favourite Buckingham who had sacrificed Bacon and in his distress extorted York House from him, took the opportunity to extend his influence over the heir to the throne, Prince Charles. On 27 March 1625 King James died at Theobalds in Hertfordshire, with Buckingham at his bedside. Bishop John Williams preached the funeral sermon and he was buried in the Henry VII chapel in Westminster Abbey on 5 May, with the Earl of Mar and Kellie ominously writing the world now belonged to Charles and Buckingham.9 Following his succession there was no return to favour for Bacon or any offer of a position in the new regime or government and the two of them Charles I and Buckingham believed
they could jointly rule without the need or advice of the kingdom’s greatest and wisest statesman. It was a decision of consequence that not only had serious and potentially dangerous implications for Bacon, but it may also have prevented the impeachment and assassination of Buckingham and the eventual deposing and the state execution of Charles I as well as the bloody English Civil War.

In early April Bacon was officially dismissed from the Privy Council as reported by Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton ‘[the] order was given for the earls of Suffolke, Middlesex, and Bristow, the Vicounts Wallingford and St Albans, the Lords Wotton and Baltimore not to take the oath, and so are discharged from the counsaile.’ This official move might well have moved Bacon to seriously consider the consequences and dangers of life under a new royal regime and the need for contingency plans if the matter could not be reversed or improved upon. He knew better than anyone and had first-hand experience of the behaviour of monarchs towards those they perceived as a threat or had fallen out of favour.

In a matter of no time he began making plans about his life and death prompting him to make a much enlarged and detailed Last Will and Testament. After consultations with those close to him and dealing with some practical arrangements he commenced the formal process of making a will on 23 May one of such detail and complexity that it was not completed until six months later in the December. With an eye firmly fixed on posterity Bacon magnificently addresses himself to the world and future ages ‘For my name and memory, I leave it to men’s charitable speeches, and to foreign nations and the next ages.’ As Bacon knew, and Ben Jonson articulated, he would never be forgotten—he was the greatest poet and dramatist ‘Not for an age but for all time’ and about his own Shakespeare plays prophesized ‘How many ages hence, Shall this our lofty scene be acted over, In states unborn and accents yet unknown!’ (Julius Caesar: 3:1:112-14). This was followed by an instruction shrouded in secrecy that would have implications for the next four centuries one which is still very much in play:

Also whereas I have made up two register books, the one of my orations or speeches, the other of my epistles or letters, whereof there may be use; and yet because they touch upon business of state, they are not fit to be put into the hands but of some councillor, I do devise and bequeath them to the right honourable my very good lord [Bishop Williams] the lord bishop of London, and the chancellor of his majesty’s duchy of Lancaster. Also, I desire my executors, especially my brother [Sir John] Constable, and also Mr. Bosvile [Sir William Boswell], presently after my decease, to take into their hands all my papers whatsoever, which are either in cabinets, boxes, or presses, and them to seal up until they may at leisure peruse them.

This passage needs to be read alongside what appears to be an earlier draft of this will described in Archbishop Tenison’s Baconiana as ‘A Transcript (by the Publisher) out of the Lord Bacon’s last Will, relating especially, to his Writings’:

But towards that durable part of Memory, which consisteth in my Writings, I require my Servant, Henry Percy, to deliver to my Brother Constable, all my Manuscript-Compositions, and the Fragments also of such as are not Finished; to the end that, if any of them be fit to be Published, he may accordingly dispose of them. And herein I desire him, to take the advice of Mr. Selden, and Mr. Herbert, of the Inner Temple, and to publish or suppress what shall be thought fit. In particular, I wish the Elegie, which I writ in felicem Memoriam Elizabethae, may be Published.

Mr Selden, is of course, Bacon’s inward friend, the lawyer and historian John Selden, a poet himself and a great lover of poetry, who swapped verses with Ben Jonson, and
also gave thanks to the Rosicrucian apologist Robert Fludd whose name is attached to *Apologia Compendiaria* (Compendious Apology for the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross) and *Tractatus Apologeticus* (The Apologetic Tract for the Society of the Rosy Cross) defending and praising the first and second manifestos, the *Fama* and *Confessio* of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood. Seldon worked closely with Bacon on *The History of King Henry the Seventh* (1622) at the time he wrote the preface to Augustine’s *A Discoverie of Errours* (1622), which was going through the Jaggard family printing press at the same time of the Shakespeare First Folio. Isaac Jaggard presented Vincent with an early copy of the Shakespeare First Folio wherein he wrote ‘Ex dono Willelmi Iaggard Typographi, a° 1623’. He also wrote *A Brief Discourse Touching the Office of Lord Chancellor of England* which Selden dedicated to Bacon that was posthumously published in the third edition of *Resvscitatio, Or, Bringing into Pvblick Light Several Pieces of the Works Civil, Historical, Philosophical, & Theological, Hitherto Sleeping of the Right Honourable Francis Bacon*. The Mr. Herbert of the Inner Temple was a kinsman of the poet George Herbert and the ‘Incomparable Pair of Brethren’ William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, then Grand Master of England and Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery to whom Bacon dedicated the Shakespeare First Folio.

Like Bacon’s first editor Dr William Rawley his second editor Thomas Tenison, was a member of Bacon’s Rosicrucian Brotherhood and was privy to the secrets about his life and death, and his secret writings, including those of the Shakespeare poems and plays. How do we know this? Simple, he just tells us. Firstly, he says:

And those who have true skill in the Works of the Lord Veralum, [Lord Bacon] like great Masters in Painting, can tell by the Design, the Strength, the way of Colouring, whether he was the Author of this or the other Piece, though his Name be not to it.  

Secondly in reference to Bacon’s *De Augmentis Scientiarum* which he was aware was published within days of Bacon’s Shakespeare First Folio he points to his famous Biliteral Cipher. Which, as his Rosicrucian Brother Dr Tenison knew, was put to use by Bacon in the First Folio in the knowledge one day someone would finally decipher it (an remarkable feat achieved by the American Elizabeth Wells Gallup) revealing him as the incomparable poet and dramatist Shakespeare:

The fairest, and most correct Edition of this Book in Latine, is that in Folio, printed at London, Anno 1623. And whosoeuer understand the Lord Bacon’s Cypher, let him consult that accurate Edition. For, in some other Editions which I have perused, the form of the Letters of the Alphabet, in which much of the Mysterie consisteth, is not observed: But the Roman and Italic shapes of them are confounded.

He was also familiar with Bacon’s simple and kay cipher systems which Dr Tenison simultaneously conceals and reveals with simple elegance and adroitness. On page 257 (Francis Bacon (100)/Fra Rosicrosse (157) in simple cipher) in which he refers to the ‘death’ of Bacon, an account which is continued over to the next page, on the page opposite p. 259, the number for Shakespeare in kay cipher, the first line reads ‘That is, Francis Bacon’. Dr Rawley and Dr Tenison being just the first two editors in a long line of Bacon editors belonging to his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood who to the current day jealously guard over the secret legacy of Bacon: the secrets of his life and the circumstances surrounding his death, and his secret concealed authorship of the Rosicrucian manifestos and his immortal Shakespeare poems and plays.

In his Last Will and Testament published on 19 December 1625 in the presence of among others his first editor and English biographer Dr Rawley Bacon appointed as
his executors Sir Humphrey May, Chancellor of his Majesty’s Duchy of Lancaster and his brother-in-law Sir John Constable (to whom he previously dedicated the 1612 edition of his Essays). In a strategic move hoping for the protection and support of the royal favourite and some kind of restoration in his fortunes with King Charles, Bacon made Buckingham of one its supervisors:

I name and intreat to be one of my supervisors, my most noble, constant, and true friend, the duke of Buckingham, unto whom I do most humbly make this my last request, that he will reach forth his hand of grace to assist the just performance of this my will, and likewise that he will be graciously pleased for my sake to protect and help such of my good servants, as my executors shall at any time recommend to his grace’s favour: and also I desire his grace in all humbleness to command the memory of my long-continued and faithful service unto my most gracious sovereign, who ever when he was prince was my patron, as I shall (who have now, I praise God, one foot in heaven) pray for him while I have breath.

And because of his grace’s great business, I presume also to name for another of my supervisors, my good friend and near ally the master of the rolls [Sir Julius Caesar].

He had already called on Sir Humphrey May, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster ‘begging his assistance with the new King’ and ‘for assistance in his arrears’. He now urged him to press his suits with Buckingham on his return from Paris ‘I could wish that you took some occasion to speak to him generally, to my advantage, before you move to him any particular suit; and to let me know ho you find him’, and in dire financial straits Bacon asks him, to remind the Lord Treasurer touching his monies.

His situation was becoming increasingly desperate with the King and Buckingham all but freezing him out in whose hands his life, future well-being, and financial security rested. Bacon had continually appealed to King Charles and Buckingham directly and indirectly, repeatedly calling upon influential intermediaries to intervene on his behalf, and friends to press his suits and requests for his personal and political rehabilitation. He now turned to the well-used device of his masterful pen. On 13 March 1625 the third and final edition of Bacon’s Essays was entered on the Stationers’ Register to Richard Whitaker and Hannah Barret and published shortly after with a dedication designed to remind its dedicatee of his faithful service to the new monarch, when he was Prince of Wales, and his father before him King James, as well as Buckingham, who Bacon had spent many years advising and supporting in his rise to prominence:

TO
THE RIGHT
HONORABLE MY
VERY GOOD Lo. THE DUKE
of Buckingham his Grace, Lo.

EXCELLENT Lo.
SALOMON saies; A good Name is as a precious oyntment; And I assure my selfe, such wil your Graces Name, bee, with Posteritie. For your Fortune, and Merit both, have beene Eminent. And you have planted Things, that are like to last, I doe now publish my Essays; which, of all my other workes, have beene most Currant: For that, as it seems, they come home, to Mens Businesse, and Bosomes. I have enlarged them, both in Number, and Weight; So that they are indeed a New Worke. I thought it therefore agreeable, to my Affection, and Obligation to your Grace, to prefix your Name before them, both in English, and in Latine. For I doe conceive, that the Latine Volume of them, (being in the Universall Language) may
last, as long as Bookes last. My *Instauration*, I dedicated to the *King*: My *Historie of HENRY the Seuenth*, (which I have now translated into Latine) and my *Portions of Naturall History*, to the *Prince*: And these I dedicate to your *Grace*: Being of the best Fruits, that by the good Encrease, which *God*, gives to my Pen and Labours, I could yeeld. *God* leade your *Grace* by the Hand.

*Your Graces most Obliged and faithful Servant,*

FR. S'. ALBAN.21

Sometime between November 1625 and I January 1626 (the date given to the letter by Spedding) Bacon wrote to Buckingham again to congratulate him on his male heir born on 17 November. As usual with Bacon the letter was written in code with liberal hints at his real meaning and intent ‘you are fortunate as well in your house as in the state of the kingdom’, implying a contrast with his own circumstances, that lay in the opposite. His blessing not only comes from God but Bacon reminds him it also comes from the king ‘Myself, I praise his divine Majesty, have gotten some step into health’, words intended for the king, that he hoped Buckingham would pass on. To underline it Bacon reminds Buckingham and by proxy the king ‘My wants are great’ and just in case Buckingham has missed it, he adds ‘but yet I want not a desire to do your Grace service’. He ends by saying with his trademark wit and humour ‘I marvel that your Grace should think to pull down the monarchy of Spain without my good help. Your Grace will give me leave to be merry, however the world goeth with me.’22

Around the beginning of the year Bacon wrote to Sir Humphrey May, Chancellor of the Duchy in anticipation of the meeting of the new parliament, which confirms that he had not received a full pardon from the king or leave to resume his parliamentary duties, reiterating his request to ‘sound the Duke of Buckingham’s good affection towards me, before you do move him in the particular petitions’:

Only the present occasion doth invite me to desire, that his Grace would procure me a pardon of the King of the whole sentence. My writ for Parliament I have now had twice before the time, and that without any express restraint not to use it. It is true that I shall not be able, in respect of my health, to attend Parliament; but yet I mought make a proxy. Time hath turned envy to pity; and I have had a long cleansing week of five years’ expiation and more. Sir John Bennet hath his pardon; my Lord of Somerset hath his pardon; and, they say, shall sit in Parliament. My Lord of Suffolk cometh to Parliament, though not to Council. I hope I deserve not to be the only outcast.23

These were the words of a desperate man who had finally run out of patience with the King and Buckingham who were very deliberately ignoring his plight and requests of which they had no intention of receiving with any grace and compassion. The writing was very much on the wall and with little or no hope of relief and rehabilitation the time had arrived for him to face up to some harsh truths and difficult decisions. There is also the possibility, and in light of the evidence and circumstances, the likelihood that Bacon had heard through back channels and highly placed friends, that both the King and Buckingham wished him ill, or worse, represented a very real danger to his life.

For reasons unknown sometime in January 1626 Bacon travelled from Gorhambury up to London most probably to meet and liaise with some of his friends and members of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood to discuss his future plans at a meeting that may have taken place at Canonbury Tower.24 For the previous decade Bacon had owned the lease on Canonbury Tower which still stands well preserved in Islington,
North London, and is perhaps the oldest surviving Rosicrucian-Freemasonic Lodge in the world, and until recently, home to the Francis Bacon Society and the Canonbury Masonic Research Centre. However this may be, on 26 January Bacon wrote a letter from his chambers at Gray’s Inn petitioning Secretary Conway to forward a suit by his ‘good friend and late servant’, one Mr Percy, ‘for the making of a friend of his Baronet.’ His standard biographer Spedding points out that ‘we have no particular account of his occupations there until the end of March’ on his way to Arundel House, the London residence of his close friend the Earl of Arundel. Or, put another way by Jardine and Stewart, the letter to Secretary Conway is the ‘only sure information we have of Francis Bacon’s activities in early 1626. Less than three months later he was dead’. Or was he?

In the meantime in the spring of 1626 the Earl of Arundel also found himself on the wrong side of the royal displeasure of King Charles and the favourite Buckingham. On 4 March he was arrested on the pretext he had allowed his son Lord Maltravers to marry a royal ward Lady Elizabeth Stuart, the daughter of the Duchess of Lennox, preventing royal plans to marry her to Lord Lorne. In reality this was a convenient charade. King Charles and Buckingham had known about the marriage since at least 6 February and had done nothing. The real reason for his imprisonment was Arundel’s powerful and influential presence in the House of Lords and his five proxy votes ‘In recent weeks, he had swayed the vote on a bill to reform the House of Lords’ system of proxy voting and to eliminate absenteeism-a move that threatened Buckingham’s power base.’ Following his arrest the Earl of Arundel was taken to the Tower where he remained for weeks preventing him from attending the sessions of the House of Lords and galvanizing opposition support against Buckingham and through him the King:

Relations between Arundel and Charles could not have got off to a more disastrous beginning, but the matter did not end there. Vindictive by nature, Charles was determined to have his pound of flesh. The method he chose almost certainly left traces of resentment in Arundel for the rest of his life, as was certainly the case with his wife. He was now fined heavily and, because he had been extravagant for years, the only way money could be raised was by selling off lands in East Anglia.

The House of Lords were outraged Arundel’s incarceration and effective banishment from taking his place in the House and saw it as an infringement of their privileges. It was the first time a peer had been prevented from attending a session since Edward III had imprisoned the Bishop of Winchester and the House of Lord’s demanded his immediate release from the Tower. He was freed in the April shortly after Bacon’s ‘death’ at the Earl of Arundel’s House at Highgate. In a turn of events that no doubt would not have surprised Bacon who also possessed an acute sense of poetical justice, the most hated and reviled figure in the kingdom Buckingham, was now about to face impeachment. The House of Commons had set up a committee ‘to identify the causes of the evils by which the state was afflicted and to propose remedies’:

The committee decided that Buckingham was the principal cause and that he should therefore be impeached. In the charges presented to the Lords on 8 May 1626, he was accused of holding too many offices; of delivering English ships into French hands for use against the Huguenots; of selling honours and offices; of procuring titles for his kindred; and, finally of poisoning James I.
The last of these charges refers to one of the most explosive conspiracies of the reign of King James I one conveyed and fuelled by a pamphlet written by George Eglisham in which he openly and directly accuses the Duke of Buckingham of having poisoned King James and other members of the nobility, including the Earl of Southampton, to whom Bacon had previously dedicated his two Shakespeare poems Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece.

Until recently there was very little known about its author George Eglisham, who has been variously described as a physician, polemicist, poet and a philosopher. He settled in England in 1613 or 1614 and soon after he set up a medical practice in or around London and was afterwards appointed one of King James personal physicians in 1616. His medical practice and attendance on James I at court would have no doubt have brought him into regular contact with Bacon who had enjoyed a rapid rise during the Jacobean reign appointed King’s Counsel, Solicitor and Attorney-General, before emulating his revered father Sir Nicholas Bacon with his appointment as Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor of England. Curiously, or coincidently, in the years leading up to the writing of the pamphlet in which he accuses Buckingham of the murder of King James, George Eglisham was residing at Bacon House in Noble Street, Aldersgate. The house originally known as Shelley House was rebuilt and remodelled by Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon and renamed Bacon House. Whether it was the earliest London home of Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon and how long they resided there is not recorded but at some point some part of it was used to house a printing press. Whether the premises and printing press were used to print clandestine publications, or works bearing a false imprint, remains elusive. The Recorder of London William Fleetwood, the dedicatee of the principal source for the Shakespeare play Measure for Measure, lived there for a number of years. The Queen’s printer Christopher Barker, took a lease on the property which he afterward purchased outright. For many years Barker and his son Robert based their growing printing business at Bacon House and played prominent roles in the Stationers’ Company under the watchful eye of Bacon’s uncle Sir William Cecil, Lord Burghley. In the early part of the Jacobean reign the property was briefly owned by Nicholas Goffe and his son before it passed to George Smythes, a goldsmith and alderman who served as the Sheriff of London in 1611-12. When he died in 1615 his widow Sarah inherited Bacon House. She remarried in 1616 to Sir Arthur Savage, Vice-Treasurer and Privy Councillor in Ireland, but her husband spent most of his time away from Bacon House. For whatever reason some years later Sarah entered into an agreement acquiring a co-owner and co-resident at Bacon House in the form of George Eglisham. He resided there for a number of years from the early 1620s during the period leading up to his pamphlet describing the secret history of the murder of James I written in late 1625 or early 1626, in the house situated within walking distance from Francis Bacon’s living quarters at Gray’s Inn.

In the work usually known by the title The Forerunner of Revenge George Eglisham who had served King James as his personal physician for the past decade petitioned both Charles I and parliament to have the Duke of Buckingham put on trial for the alleged murder of King James. The work is addressed ‘To the most potent Monarch Charles King of greate Britannie Fruance and Ireland’, in which Eglisham wastes no time in unfolding his central allegation:

what greater, what more royall occasion in the world could bee offered vnto yo[u]r Maj[ies]t[ye] to shewe yo[u]r vnpartiall disposition in matter of Iustice at [th]e first ef[n]trie of yo[u]r raigne, then this w[h]ich I offer, my lust complaint against Buckingham by whom yo[u]r maiestie suffereth yo[u]r selfe soe farr to be ledd, that yo[u]r best subiects are in doubte,
whether he is your king, or you his. If your Majesty knew and considered how he had tyrannized over his Lord and Master King James, the worldly creator of his Fortunes, howe insolent, howe ingrate an oppressor, what A Murtherer and Traytor he hath proved himselfe towards him, howe treacherous to his upholdine Friend the Marquess of Hamelton and others, your Majesty maye thinke the givinge waye to the lawes commaunded against him to yield A most glorious Field for your Majesty to walke in, and displaye the banner of your royall vertues.

In a second address ‘To the Most hono[r]ble [th]e Nobillitye Knights and Burgeses of both [th]e houses of Parlyam[en]t of the Kingdome of Englande’ Eglisham reminds them that the chief care of the king and parliament is the protection and preservation of the lives, liberties and estates of its citizens from private and public injury. Without law and justice, no kingdom, commonwealth, or society, can hope to survive and it is the role of the king and parliament to censure wrongs. This guiding principle was so great in King James, states Eglisham, that James had often publicly protested even in the presence of Prince Charles that ‘if his owne Sonne should committ Murther, or anye such execrable act of iniustice, he would not spare him, but would haue him dye for it, and would haue him more severelye punished then anye other. For hee well observed noe greater iniustice, noe iniquity more intolerable can be done by man to man then murther…of all injuries, of all [th]e acts of iniustice, and of all things most to be looked into, murther is the greatest, and of all murtheres the poysoning, vnder trust and profession of Freindshipp, is the most haynous, w[hi]ch if you suffer to goe vnpunished, lett no man thinke themselves so secure to live amongst you, as amongst the wildest and most furious Beasts in the world’. As all the judges of the kingdom and officers of state are his creatures or allies, or afraid to directly challenge him, as the accused Buckingham is the most powerful person in the kingdom, parliament is the only body that can hold him to account and deliver justice for the whole kingdom. For too long, Eglisham continues, Buckingham has been allowed at his own pleasure to procure the calling and breaking up of parliament for his own purposes ‘placing or displacinge the officers of Iustice, of [th]e Cou[n]cell, of the Kings Cou[r]te, of the Courtes of Iustice to his viole[n]t pleasure, and his ambitious vilanie moveth him.’

Then turning to King Charles, he asks, what hope is there for justice, when everyone lives in fear that if any allegation or complaint is made against Buckingham, the duke will send a poisoner or assassin to murder him.

He proceeded to describe in graphic detail the poisoning of the Marquis of Hamilton brought about by a dispute with Buckingham regarding his designs to marry his niece into the royal blood of England and Scotland through a match made with Hamilton’s son. Following several heated exchanges the scorned and ‘the wonderfully vindictive’ Buckingham threatened revenge and soon after the Marquis of Hamilton fell very ill as a result of poisoning and died not long after. To conceal his cause of death the Buckingham family tried to have him buried the same night in Westminster Church but Eglisham but several of Hamilton’s family and friends refused, and insisted his body be examined by his physicians. The tell-tale signs of poisoning soon manifested itself. No sooner was Hamilton dead than his body began to violently swell, with his belly expanding to the size of an ox, the thighs and arms increasing to many times their normal size, and his neck thickening out as wide as his shoulders. His whole face quickly became unrecognizable, all bloated and distorted, his rippling skin spreading over his head, eyes and nose, as his hair fell from his disfigured head. The whole body from head to toe was covered in very large yellow, green and red blisters, with blood seeping out of the various cavities.
A jury of physicians were called for including those of the Duke of Buckingham and independent physicians from the College of London to bear witness on account of the state of his body that the Marquis had been poisoned. When Buckingham arrived with his physicians before they were permitted to see the body, rather than instructing them to impartially inquire into all causes of death, he threateningly warned them to be beware of speaking of poison or poisoning. One of the other doctors, a Dr Moore, himself not under Buckingham’s control or direction, when the body was uncovered exclaimed in horror that he had never seen anything like it and in like manner all the other doctors and surgeons in attendance affirmed they too had not seen the like even though some had practiced across Europe. With the exception of one doctor, who two years previously had saw the body of another of Buckingham’s enemies, the Earl of Southampton (d. November 1624) opened in the Netherlands which was also blistered in like manner to the body of Lord Hamilton. On seeing and hearing their reaction a Dr Lister one of the duke’s servile creatures drew them all aside one after another and whispered in their ears in an attempt to silence them. Some in fear of the all powerful Buckingham left without saying anything but those who remained were in agreement the Marquis of Hamilton had died as a result of being poisoned. Afterwards the Duke of Buckingham feigned grief and sorrow to the great and good and to divert suspicion that he had poisoned Hamilton he blamed it on King James who Buckingham said hated Hamilton, which only served to make himself as well as the king look guilty of his death.

In February 1623 Buckingham had the direction of King James accompanied Prince Charles on his journey to Spain for the marriage negotiations for the hand of the Infanta Maria. Disguised and under assume names they headed for Paris and arrived in Madrid on 7 March where they stayed at the house of the English Ambassador to Spain John Digby, first Earl of Bristol. When they arrived Buckingham knocked the door while Prince Charles concealed in the shadows. The door was opened by Henry Jermyn, the future Earl of St Albans. In his brilliant full-length biography *Henry Jermyn Stuart Spymaster and Architect of the British Empire* Adolph, who suggests Bacon might have been Jermyn’s (1605–84) early mentor, states Jermyn later chose his title as Earl of St Albans, partly in memory of his kinsman and hero, Lord Bacon, Viscount St Alban, who he worshipped until his dying day. Jermyn was also a member of his Rosicrucian –Freemasonry Brotherhood and later elected Grand Master of England. The behaviour of Buckingham in Spain which involved reports of sexual licentiousness did not endear him to his Spanish hosts and when the negotiations of the Spanish match collapsed he and Prince Charles departed from Madrid in September and set foot back in England at Plymouth on 5 October 1623. The following morning they arrived at York House the erstwhile official residence of Bacon when Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor England. The journey of Prince Charles and Buckingham to Spain cemented their relationship, and consolidated the power of Buckingham over Charles, who was now looking beyond the reign of his lover King James, and already positioning himself, for the time of his death, and the succession of his son and heir. The change in all their relationships was revealed in a letter by King James who complained that when his son Prince Charles had set out for Spain he had been, as well affected to that nation as heart could desire, and as well disposed as any son in Europe; but now he was strangely carried away with rash and youthful counsels and followed the humour of Buckingham, who had he knew not how many devils within since that journey.
The change and deterioration in the private relationship between King James and the Duke of Buckingham was as reported by Eglisham in *The Forerunner of Revenge* the principal reason which eventually led to the murder by poisoning of King James. While in Spain Buckingham had been advertised by letters how James had begun ‘to censure him in his absence freely, and that manye spoke boldlye to the Kinge against him, and how [the] Kinge had intelligence from Spain of his vnwthorne carriage in Spaine’. In the royal household Buckingham intercepted diplomatic correspondence from foreign princes addressed to King James containing intelligence and information withheld from him which the duke replied to without the king’s knowledge or consent. When James eventually became aware of this serious breach in royal protocol and the betrayal of his trust Buckingham realised King James was highly offended and that the ‘kings mynde was begin[n]ing to alter towards him, suffering him to bee quarrelled and affronted in his ma[jes]t[ie]s pr[e]sence & observing [that] [th]e kinge receaved my Lo[rd] of Bristall to bee A rodd for him, vrging daylye his dispatch for Frau[n]ce, and expecting [th]e Earle of Gondomar his coming into Eng[land] in his absence, feared much that [th]e Earl of Gondomar, whoe as it seemede was gr[ea]tlye esteemed & wonderfullye credited by the Kinge, would second my Lo[rd] of Bristalls accusations ag[ain]st him.’

The king also through the examination of some of the nobility and the Privy Council discovered that Buckingham had said after his return from Spain that the ‘king was an old man, it was now tyne for him to be at his rest, and to be confined so some Parke, to passe [the] rest of his time in hunting, and [th]e Prince to be crowned. The more the kinge vrged him to be gone to Fraunce [th]e more shifts he made to stay, for he did evidently see [th]e kinge was fullye resolved to ridd himselfe of the oppr[e]sion wherein he held him.’

The Duke of Buckingham knew his position as the favourite was now very precarious and all his titles, preferment, privileges, property, estates and enormous wealth lay in the balance, and that his life which he conceived was in very mortal danger, would end with his neck severed from his head. As the time passed Buckingham made a simple calculation and settled upon the decision to save his own skin by murdering the king:

The kinge being sick of A tertian Ague & [that] in [th]e springe, wh[i]ch was of it selfe never found deadlye. The Duke tooke his oppor[tun]itie when all the kings Doctors were at Dinner, vpon, [th]e mundaye before the kinge dyed, w[i]thout their knowledge or consent, offered a whit[e] powder to the kinge to take, the w[hi]ch the kinge longe time refused, but overcome by his flatteringe opportunitie, at length tooke it, dranke it in whit[e] wine, and ymediateleye became worse and worse falling into manye soundings and paynes or violent Fluxes of [th]e Bellye, soo tormenting that his ma[jes]t ye cryed out alowd O this w[hi]ch powd[er] this white[e] Powder, would to God I had never taking it, it will cost mee my liffe, In like manner the Countisse of Buckingham my Lorde of Buckinghams Mother vpo[n] the Frydaye thereafter, [th]e Phisic[i]ons alsose being absent & at dinner, & not made acquainted w[i]th her doings, applied A Plaster to the Kings harte & breast, wherevpo[n] his ma[jes]t ye grewe fainte, shorte breathed & in great agonie. Some of [th]e Phisitians after dinner returned to see the kinge, by [th]e offensive smell of [th]e Plaster, pr[ee]d it to bee about [th]e kinge hurtfull vnto him, & searched what it could be, found it out, & exclaymed [th]at [th]e kinge was poysoned. Then Buckingham enting comau[n]ded the Phisicons out of the Roome, caused one to be committit pr[i]son[er] to his owne Chamber, and another to remove fro[m] Courte, quarrelled w[i]th others of the kings servants in [th]e sicke kings owne pr[e]sence, soo farre that he offered to drowe his sworde against them in the Kings sight, And Buckinghams mother kneeling before the kinge w[i]th A brazen face cried out *Justice Justice S[i]r I demaund Justice of yo[u]r ma[jes]t yte, The kinge asking her for what? shee answered for what that w[hi]ch their lives is noe sufficient satisfac[tion], for saying that my Sonne and I haue poysoned yo[u]r ma[jes]t yte, Poysoned mee said the kinge, w[i]th that he turninge himselfe sounded, The Sunday
thereafter the king dyed, & Bucking[ham] desired the Phisicians whoe attended the kinge to signe w[i]th their hands, writs. A testimoye, that the Powder w[hi]ch he gave the kinge was a good sufficient and safe medicine, w[hi]ch they refused to doe; Bucking[hams] Creatures did spread abroad A rumor in London [tha]t Bucking[ham] was soe sorrie at the kings deathe, that he would haue dyed, that he would haue killed himselfe yf they had not hindered him, w[hi]ch yo[u]r Petitioner pu[r]posely inquired of them that were neere him at that time, whoe said, [tha]t neith[er] in the time of the kings sicknes, nor after his deathe, hee was any more mowed then yf there had neither happened either sicken or deathe to the kinge…in [th]e meane tyme [th]e kings Bodye and head swelled about measures, his haire w[i]th the skinne of his head stucke to the Pillowe, his nayles became loose vpon his Fingers and Toes, yo[u]r Petition[er] needeth to saye noe more to vnderstanding men. Onlye one thinge he beseecheth, [tha]t taking [th]e traytor whoe ought to be taken, w[i]thout anye feare of his greatnes the other matters be examined, the Accessaries w[i]th the guiltie punished/

Finis.48

Immediately or soon after the explosive and sensational *The Forerunner of Revenge* was completed a number of scribal manuscript copies began to circulate in London and around the kingdom. At least two dozen contemporary or near contemporary scribal copies of the English version of the tract are known to have survived. Some of these copies have been traced to individuals or families: the royal officer Sir George More of Loseley, Surrey; William Ingdilby of Ripley Castle in Yorkshire; Sir Jerome Alexander, a Justice of the Irish Courts of Common Pleas; the Percy Earls of Northumberland (at whose Northumberland House Bacon’s collections of manuscripts originally containing copies of his Shakespeare plays *Richard II* and *Richard III* were later discovered); and descendants of Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon and his son the erstwhile Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor of England Francis Bacon abandoned by the principal target of the tract George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham and his cohort King Charles 1.49 The full history of *The Forerunner’s* English circulation in print observe Bellany and Cogswell ‘will probably remain hidden’.50 The earliest known mention of it occurs in a letter by James Meddus to Joseph Mead, fellow of Christ Church, Cambridge dated 5 May 1626 wherein he reported he had seen a printed copy of the tract and four months later on 16 September Mead (a friend of Bacon’s) in a letter to Sir Martin Stuteville in Suffolk says ‘A friend passing lately this way’ had showed him ‘a printed copy Eggesheim’s’ book.51 The work written by Eglisham who had resided at Bacon House built by Sir Nicholas Bacon, with a number of copies owned by Bacon’s family, friends and colleagues, that of course was no stranger to Bacon himself who knew Buckingham perhaps better than anyone as well as his cohort Charles 1 (1600-49), whom Bacon had known from almost the very day the Stuart king was born. In the period leading up to his supposed death in April 1626 and in the weeks and months following, *The Forerunner* was being read in both manuscript and in printed copies in and around London by members of the Houses of Parliament, whose members partly primed by the tract impeached Buckingham on a series of charges including the murder by poisoning of King James 1.

The fight against Buckingham was led by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, then Grand Master of England and his brother Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, to whom Bacon had dedicated the Shakespeare First Folio, and Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel a future Grand Master of England in whose house at Highgate Bacon supposedly died.52 The basic circumstances surrounding the death or murder of James I are not disputed. On two occasions Buckingham and his mother gave the king ‘medicines’ not prescribed by the king’s physicians including two plasters and a potion. The first plaster secretly applied was left on the king for hours before it was detected. In the second instance the potion and a plaster were administered with other physicians and attendants present.53
Eglisham alleges that the plaster and the potions were administered by Buckingham and his mother to deliberately poison King James a view shared by some of the doctors and attendants.

The parliamentary investigations into the circumstances surrounding the death and/or murder of James I ‘took place in the shadow of Eglisham’s secret history; indeed the two became inseparably connected.’54 We still do not know when manuscripts copies of *The Forerunner of Revenge* were first circulating in London or when printed copies of the tract arrived in England. The purchase of a copy of *The Forerunner* in Paris on 18 April by the artist Peter Paul Rubens is the earliest recorded appearance of Eglisham’s secret history of the murder of James I. The Latin edition entitled *Prodromvs Vindictae In Ducem Bvckinghamiaei, pro virulenta caede potentissimi Magnae Britanniae Regis Jacobi, nec-non Marchionis Hamiltonij, ac aliorum virorum Principum* with its false Frankfurt imprint was printed by one Jan Van Meerbeek who worked out of a Brussels printing shop at the sign of St Anne. This printer was also responsible for the English edition with the same false imprint of *The Forerunner Of Revenge Vpon the Duke of Bvckingham for the poysoning the most potent King Iames his happy memory King of great Britain, and the Lord Marquis of Hamilton and others of the nobility. Discouered by M. George Eglisham one of King Iames his Physicians for his Majesties person aboute the space of ten yeares. Franckfort. 1626*.55 It is not known when the tracts were printed or whether Meerbeek’s Latin edition appeared before the English edition. Late in 1626 Bacon’s cousin Sir Henry Wotton told King James daughter Princess Elizabeth, otherwise known as the Queen of Bohemia wife of Frederick V Elector Palatine, King of Bohemia (whose ‘Rosicrucian’ wedding was organised by Bacon) that Eglisham’s abominable tract had been ‘published and printed towards the time the last Parliament, in divers languages’.56 Afterwards Sir Edward Hyde maintained that Eglisham ‘had sent over a small pamphlet’ from Brussels ‘about the beginning of that Parliament.’57 These references place the publication of the Latin or English version of Eglisham’s pamphlet to February or March 1626.58 This suggests that the writing and production of the work most probably began sometime in late 1625 or the early part of 1626:

The select committee’s questioning of the royal physicians began on 24 April and ended two days later. By 1 May, Eglisham’s pamphlet-in both English and Latin versions-was the talk of London. On 2 May, Herman informed Middlesex that there “are bookees sent over from Bruxells to some of the lords from one Doctor Ecclestone London. On 2 May, Herman informed Middlesex that there “are bookes sent over from Bruxells to some of the lords from one Doctor Ecclestone to the king and the lords of the Council.59

The printing and distribution of *The Forerunner of Revenge* is very reminiscent of the printing and distribution of the anonymous *Leicester’s Commonwealth* (originally titled *The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Arts of Cambridge, 1584*) believed to have been printed in Belgium or France at Flanders, Paris or Rouen.60 Within a year Latin and French translated versions (with additions) were circulating on the continent with its title very explicitly indicating its contents *A Discourse on the abominable life, plots,
treasons, murders, falsehoods, poisonings, lusts, incitements and evil stratagems employed by Lord Leicester. As its foreign language titles indicates the notorious tract presented a long list of his alleged attempted murders, murders and other assassinations many of them by way of poisoning, a repulsive practice for which Leicester employed an Italian poisoner named Guilio Borgarucci, known as Doctor Julio. In fact according to common fame the same title could have readily sufficed for the Duke of Buckingham by merely replacing his name in the title with that of the Earl of Leicester. In fact the very obvious connection was made explicit in a dispatch in October 1624 relayed by William Trumbull, the English diplomat of James I at the Brussels court of Archduke Albert of Austria, who had learned of plans to publish ‘a libell against my L. Duke of Buckingham, under the Title of Buckinghams Common Welth in imitation of that (it should seeme) which long since was written and printed of the Earle of Leicester.’ If this libel against Buckingham was published no copy of it survives. For more than four hundred years orthodox scholarship including professors Alastair Bellany and Thomas Cogswell in their groundbreaking and monumental The Murder of King James I (Yale University Press, 2015) have laboured under the delusion Leicester’s Commonwealth was an English libel published as part of a Catholic conspiracy to discredit the favourite Leicester. The writing, production and distribution of Leicester’s Commonwealth was actually organised and directed by the English Secret Service in a secret operation to destroy the Earl of Leicester who like the Duke of Buckingham was a threat to national security. An incomplete manuscript copy of Leicester’s Commonwealth is found among Bacon’s collection of MSS, usually known as the Northumberland Manuscript, which originally held copies of his Shakespeare plays Richard II a play primarily about royal favourites and Richard III about a cunning monarch who involved himself in schemes, plots, and the murdering of everybody, including members of his family, that stood in his way. Two plays that many would have believed in Jacobean England mirrored the circumstances of the Duke of Buckingham and his royal cohort Charles I, conspirators in a plot to murder his father James I of England.

On the afternoon of 24 April 1626 the parliamentary committee began questioning the royal physicians Henry Atkins, David Beton, James Chambers, John Craig, Alexander Ramsey, Matthew Lister, William Harvey and John More. The most eagerly anticipated witness, write Bellany and Cogswell, was John Craig the Scotsman at the centre of the March 1625 stories about Buckingham’s unauthorized intervention in the time leading up to the death or murder of King James. According to a March 1625 Newsletter Craig had challenged Buckingham after his suspicious behaviour and was clearly the doctor in the Forerunner ‘comitted pr[is]on[er] to his owne Chamber’, after exclaiming ‘[tha]t [th]e kinge was poysoned.’ In the Forerunner Eglisham had stated that many of the royal physicians were Buckingham’s creatures and that others including Craig had been ‘threatened if they kept not good tongues in their heads’. However the first witness on 24 April Alexander Ramsey ‘infuriated’ King Charles: ‘The Venetian Ambassador reported that Charles had ordered that Ramsey “remain a prisoner in his house” for his “unfavourable deposition about the late king’s death”, and a newsletter-writer observed that Ramsey “spake some thing, which extremely distasted his Majestie for which cause he is discouered”, whose testimony was highly critical of Buckingham. It is clear that the royal physicians and other witnesses were being threatened and intimidated and the arrest of Ramsey “had a chilling effect on subsequent witnesses, who, as Eliot later noted, “did not speak so fully as they were examined first”. When Dr Craig gave his evidence he revealed one very significant, telling, and explosive piece of information:
Craig testified that the doctors “sent him” and another physician “to this King [i.e. Charles] to desire him that he would advise the Lord [Buckingham] to remit all the care to the physicians.” They warned the prince that “finding that fit was higher than his other, they might ascribe it to those applications”. In the newsletters, in Eglisham’s secret history and in earlier testimony, Charles had been invisible, but Craig had now suggested that Charles knew the doctors’ concerns and had apparently done nothing to stop the duke’s medical interference.69

Not surprisingly perhaps ‘the physicians’ testimony while unsettling’ observe Bellany and Cogswell, it 'had not unambiguously supported the allegation that Buckingham deliberately poisoned James. It had, however, confirmed many circumstantial details in Eglisham’s secret history, and some of the committee clearly suspected a poisoning had occurred.’70

Another witness Robert Ramsey appeared before the committee on 26 April and presented them with very curious and strange testimony about several of his exchanges with an Irishman named Piers Butler whom he linked to Buckingham and experimented with poisonous substances and potions. Probably believing his life was in danger Butler took flight. For appearances the Duke of Buckingham immediately sent instructions to Kent ordering Butler’s arrest and similarly the Privy Council dispatched couriers to Bristol and Chester ordering the seizure of Butler before he could escape to Ireland.71 His appearance at the hearings was remarkable, write Bellany and Cogswell ‘for he was as close as Parliament would come to identifying the poisoner mountebank described in The Forerunner.’72

Indeed, by 1626 Butler had also acquired a reputation as a poisoner. Late that year, when Butler travelled towards Sweden “under the pretext of making a pilgrimage”, the Scotsman Sir James Spens warned the Swedish chief minister that Butler was a dangerous man, highly skilled in “in artibus veneficis”-the arts of poison.

Spens also reported that Butler was Buckingham’s protégé, someone who, according to Venetian reports, received a “handsome salary”-perhaps as much as £1,000 a year-for “secret service”.

…Robert Ramsey’s brief testimony had dragged Piers Butler into the spotlight; consciously or not, he had startlingly confirmed elements of Eglisham’s portrait of the duke as the patron of witches and poisoners.73

On 8 June 1626 Buckingham finally responded to the charges against him with a long statement prepared with legal advice from the Attorney-General Sir Robert Heath, who owed his rise to power to Buckingham’s patronage and Nicholas Hyde, which lead to a knighthood and appointment as Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, to help prepare and draft responses to his articles of impeachment. Buckingham was further assisted by one of his other clients the Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud who had earlier drafted speeches of self-defence for Buckingham and for Charles 1 in Buckingham’s defence in the same parliament. He began by reminding the Lords ‘what is my cause now may be yours and your posterity’s hereafter’. Having been ‘born and bred’ in the state’s service he had only ever acted in the interests of the state. He freely confessed that he had been ‘raised to honour and fortunes…beyond my merit’ but insisted ‘what I have wanted in sufficiency and experience…I have endeavoured to supply by care and industry’ and he added with a flourish ‘could there be the least alienation hereafter of my heart from the service of the state for anything that hath passed, I should be the most ungratefull man living.’74 Like a good actor he had long practised his lines and had long since lost the ability to distinguish between truth and lies and it is doubtful if there was scarcely a single fool in the Lords who believed a word of it. With his well-prepared script he then
proceeded to answer the thirteen charges made against him of various acts against the state, of bribery and corruption, grants of land and money for himself and his relatives, and procuring honours for family and friends. While he admitted to ‘many weaknesses and imperfections’ he had not as far as he was concerned committed ‘heinous and high misdemeanours and crimes’ adding that ‘the King’s liberality cannot be imputed as a crime to the Duke.’

On the thirteenth and final charge of administering unauthorised medicine to King James in language betraying the influence of his lawyers and advisers he insisted the House that he had committed no crime or had done anything wrong. It was the king being sick of an ague, knowing that Buckingham had recently recovered from the same illness with the assistance of the Earl of Warwick’s physician who had administered a ‘plaster and posset drink’, who requested he received the same remedy. He was reluctant but an impatient king sent Buckingham’s servant John Baker to fetch it. The duke intervened and insisted James should not take anything before consulting his own physicians and that it should be first tried by James Palmer of his Bedchamber who was then also sick with an ague. After a quick visit to London by the time he had returned Buckingham learned ‘in his absence, the plaster and posset drink was brought and applied by his Majesty’s own command’. The king then commanded Buckingham to give some to him which he did in the presence of several of the king’s physicians, some of whom tasted it themselves, as did numerous others of the king’s Bedchamber. Still ‘the King grew somewhat worse then before’ and rumours spread ‘as if this physic had done the King hurt, and that the Duke had ministered that physic unto him without advice.’ When he acquainted the king with these rumours James answered ‘They are worse than devils that say it.’

Buckingham’s narrative was cleverly wrought, making Warwick and Palmer leading figures in his story. In place of Eglisham’s terrifying “poysonmunger mountibanck”, the actual physician who prepared the plaster and the posset was Warwick’s doctor, and the sinister posset had been tested in part by a protégé of the Herbert brothers. While Buckingham’s narrative thrust Warwick, Montgomery and Pembroke forward, it also hid his mother from view. The countess had loomed large in Eglisham’s secret history and in the doctor’s testimony. Female, disorderly and Catholic, the countess made a culturally plausible accomplice to poisoning. Obscuring her role, however protected her reputation and weakened the plausibility of the poison talk.

During the proceedings in parliament Sir John Eliot and Sir Dudley Digges had come within a whisker of insinuating the involvement of King Charles in the murder of his father. The decision by Charles not to allow Buckingham’s impeachment to proceed to trial by dissolving parliament a week later at the cost of a much needed subsidy bill, led more to believe or strongly suspect he was complicit with Buckingham in the foul act of killing a king, the very progenitor of his own royal blood:

By foreclosing the impeachment process, Charles also left the mystery of James’s death open. As accounts of the impeachment articles joined copies of Eglisham’s secret history in ever-broader circulation, the claim that James I had been murdered began to take deep root in popular political consciousness. Most talk continued to focus on Buckingham, but by sacrificing a subsidy bill to save the man who had been accused of involvement in his father’s death, Charles had left himself open to suspicion. Some wondered what he had to hide.

What Charles 1 might or was hiding, expressed by the contemporary Thomas Scott of Canterbury not too long after the dissolution of parliament, was ‘the secret of secrets’ which ‘others so much speake of” that he conspired with Buckingham: ‘He hath kild his
own father and King, and hath ascended to the throne by murther and treason’ for ‘who doth not, if it be possible, revenge his father and Predecessors death?’. 80

The hearings into the death or murder of James irreparably damaged the relationship between Charles I and parliament and his favourite the Duke of Buckingham was now the most hated and reviled man in the kingdom. Various anonymous poets and writers labelled him a poisoner and murderer that fuelled and ultimately led to his assassination at the hands of a soldier named John Felton who stabbed him to death at the Greyhound Pub in Portsmouth on 23 August 1628. His assassin Felton escaped in all the confusion but quickly gave himself up and was taken into custody by some officers of the crown. He was initially interrogated in Portsmouth and later taken to the Tower of London. As he passed through the town of Kingston on the way to London one old woman cried out ‘God bless thee, little David’, alluding to the biblical David who had slain Goliath.

His motivations for the assassination were varied and complicated. Felton had been wounded during the retreat from the Siege of Saint-Martin-de-Re an attempt by English forces under Buckingham to capture the French fortress near La Rochelle in 1627 and believed he had been passed over by the duke for promotion. He later explained it was through reading the ‘Remonstrance of the House of Parliament’ which convinced him by killing Buckingham ‘he should do his country great service’ by ridding the kingdom of a monstrous and evil tyrant. He was a man of previous good character, the younger son of a good Suffolk family from the ranks of the minor gentry and a distant relative of Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel, future Grand Master of England, a close friend of Bacon’s, at whose house at Highgate Bacon supposedly met his death. 81 The progenitor of the Bacon family, Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon, was born and raised in Suffolk and built his first country seat at Redgrave in the county which was afterwards inherited by his son and namesake Sir Nicholas Bacon (c. 1543-1624). 82 His other son Nathaniel Bacon (1546?-1622), the prominent Suffolk and Norfolk politician, was also with his elder brother Sir Nicholas Bacon, a leading member of the East Anglia gentry and most probably moved in the same circles of the Felton family who were part of the gentry of Suffolk. In fact in the surviving papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon the name of John Felton is found in a ‘Certificate of maritime resources in Norfolk’ sent to the Lord Admiral in November 1580, listing the names of ships and vessels and the names of their owners among them ‘The Daniell 76 tonnes John Felton owner’, 83 presumably a namesake and relative of the Buckingham assassin, John Felton, about whom nothing is known until the mid-1620s, when he became an army officer. 84

He is said to have been melancholy and given to too much reading and in addition to the Remonstrance against Buckingham compiled by the House of Commons Felton also possessed a copy of George Eglisham’s The Forerunner of Revenge. The government were convinced Felton had not acted alone and was part of a much wider conspiracy. On 26 August Charles 1 established a commission to discover by any means including the use of torture on the rack which the judges declared was unlawful to identify his co-conspirators and accomplices. Initially, the government considered whether members of the parliamentary opposition were implicated in the assassination but Felton repeatedly denied any hidden conspiracy stating that the Remonstrance was ‘his only confederate and setter-on’, and after three months of rigorous efforts by government, the authorities were unable to produce any evidence to the contrary.

On 27 November Felton was tried in the Court of the King’s Bench where he pleaded guilty to the charges and was summarily convicted. ‘Interestingly’, the night before his execution Felton was visited by the Earl and Countess of Arundel with their eldest son in the Tower and ceremoniously presented him with a winding sheet (a sheet in which a corpse is wrapped for burial). 85 In Lord Arundel and his Circle David Howarth states
that Buckingham’s treatment of the Earl of Arundel ‘was one of the conflicts which led to a determination on the part of the Opposition to be rid of the favourite, and on the part of the King, to be rid of Parliament. But in August 1628 the impasse was resolved when Buckingham was stabbed to death while going to review the fleet at Portsmouth. For Arundel it seemed a Godly intervention and both he and his wife visited the assassin in the Tower [where] they stayed for some time’. As leaders of the opposition Arundel, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, to whom Bacon dedicated the Shakespeare First Folio, would no doubt have all seen it as some kind divine intervention and some kind of retribution for the part Buckingham played in Bacon’s fall from grace.

In the weeks following Buckingham’s assassination as his divine nemesis Felton sat in the Tower under the threat of torture by those acting on behalf of King Charles he was seen as a national hero and celebrated all over the kingdom. In The Mermaid Tavern previously frequented by the likes of Bacon and Ben Jonson, the literary clientele drank to his health, and in The Mitre and other drinking clubs all over London, as well as up and down the whole kingdom. The poets, writers and satirists sharpened their pens with countless poems, newsletters and pamphlets circulating in manuscript and pouring from the presses celebrating Felton as a national hero and conversely portraying Buckingham as an odious and contemptible killer, murderer, and cowardly poisoner. The poisoning of King James a charge made explicit by Eglisham in *The Forerunner of Revenge* was frequently referred to by the poets and satirists as well as the poisoning of members of the nobility. In one of the mock poems ‘remarkable for its enumeration of all the crimes imputed to the duke, in contemptuous answer to Parliament’, Buckingham is made to say ‘Nor shall you ever prove I had a hand/I’ th’ poisoning of the monarch of this land,/Or the like hand by poison to intox/Southampton, Oxford, Hamilton, Lenox’. In the curious poem ‘A Dialogue Between the Duke & Dr. Lambe’, his conjuror killed in the street by the citizens ‘whose evil life, and violent death were made the subject of a popular pamphlet, in which the worst vices, poisonings and sorcery, were imputed to him’, his likewise assassinated master Buckingham says he has been damned ‘By pride, lust, murder, and foul treacherye’. Buckingham is made to acknowledge the damage he has done to the great English nation ‘Then since the fabricke of the world’s creation’ brought about his naval and military incompetence. Its author points ‘to Cales, when as proud Cecill vext,/When Essex for his life was forc’d to fly.’ This being Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon (1572-1638), son of Bacon’s cousin and friend Sir Thomas Cecil, first Earl of Exeter whose father Sir William Cecil was married to Lady Mildred Cooke Cecil, sister of Lady Anne Cooke Bacon and Robert Devereux, the third Earl of Essex, son and namesake of Bacon’s concealed royal brother Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex. The lines are immediately followed by Buckingham saying out loud that ‘By me, they say, the Pallatine was lost’, in reference to territory of the Elector Palatine and Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia whose ‘Rosicrucian’ wedding was organised by Bacon, lost by the cowardice of her father King James and the meddling interference of the favourite. In a campaign in the Low Countries where the earls of Essex, Oxford, and Southampton (to whom Bacon dedicated his Shakespeare poems *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*) were left woefully wanting by King James and Buckingham ‘Brave Oxford ever, unto whose life I lent/Some few dayes, and then I did take it from him/With Southampton’; soe I confesse my crime.’ Buckingham proceeds to confess that his crimes have exceeded those of all others:

In which I farr surpassed all before,
And for one badd deed here, there was a score.
For what with poyson, treason, and base treacherie,
My deede s, like night, would darke the very skie.⁹²

The poets competed with each to write an Epitaph for whom some saw has the most reviled and loathed man in all English history. They highlighted and emphasized his insatiable greed, corruption and treachery, a friend to the Pope, Papist and the Spaniard, murder was his trade to whose deaths he had sent thousands, and in reference to Felton, ‘hee that kill’d this killer thus,/Did save himself and us’, who was praised and saluted ‘Live ever, Felton: thou hast turn’d to dust,/Treason, ambition, murther, pride and lust.’⁹³

The national hero Felton was portrayed as the saviour of the kingdom with the poet and essayist Owen Felltham (1602?-1668) describing Felton as a second Brutus. For centuries even the most basic biographical details of Owen Felltham curiously eluded the written pages of history.⁹³ He originated from Suffolk, whose leading family was the Bacons from the time of Sir Nicholas Bacon and then afterwards though his sons Sir Nicholas Bacon, and especially, Sir Nathaniel Bacon. In the 1620s Felltham moved in the same circles as Bacon and Ben Jonson and in a genre pioneered and developed by Bacon in the English language, in 1623 Felltham issued the first edition of his Resolves; Divine, Moral, Political with its elaborate engraved title page containing 100 essays.⁹⁴ It is dedicated to Lady Dorothy Crane, daughter of Sir Henry Hobart, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, who had a long private and professional relationship with Bacon.⁹⁵ In several respects the essays in the Resolves ‘bear a resemblance in manner, and still more in matter, to the ‘Essays of Lord Bacon.’⁹⁶ During Felltham’s years in London he met Sir Kenelm Digby, a devoted disciple of Bacon’s and a member of his Rosicrucian Brotherhood, Ben Jonson who contributed two poems to the Shakespeare First Folio, as well as one of Jonson’s sons, the poet and dramatist Thomas Randolph, who in a verse contributed to the Memoriae after Bacon’s recorded death, likened him to Quirinus (which derives from the Sabine word quiris meaning lance or spear, i.e. a spear shaker), an allusion to his nome de plume Shakespeare:

When he perceived that the arts were held by no roots, and like seed scattered on the surface of the soil were withering away, he taught the Pegasean arts to grow, as grew the spear of Quirinus swiftly into a laurel tree. Therefore since he has taught the Heliconian goddesses to flourish no lapse of ages shall dim his glory. The ardour of his noble heart could bear no longer that you, divine Minerva, should be despised. His godlike pen restored your wonted honour and as another Apollo dispelled the clouds that hid you.⁹⁷

In his poem ‘On the Murder of the Duke of Buckingham’, Felltham describes Felton as a second Brutus who with others stabbed to death the tyrant Julius Caesar ‘And sure when all the patriots in the shade/Shall ranke, and their full musters there be made, Hee shall sit next to Brutus’.⁹⁸ It is a curious and interesting comparison in more ways than one. Bacon had a fascination with Julius Caesar whom he refers to and discusses in a wide range of his writings and the circumstances of the death of Julius Caesar was made more familiar to Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences in his Shakespeare play The Tragedy of Julius Caesar. In the play Brutus is part of a wide conspiracy to assassinate Caesar and both the Greek and Roman historians Plutarch and Suetonius state that the oppressive dictator and tyrant was stabbed 23 times which Bacon changes to 33 (Bacon in simple cipher) ‘Never till Caesar’s three and thirty wounds’ (5:1:53), first published in the Shakespeare First Folio in 1623. Around the time of the First Folio Ben Jonson was living with Bacon at Gorhambury assisting him in the translation of his Essays.⁹⁹ In the First Folio in his verse addressed ‘To the memory of my beloued, The Author Mr.
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE’ Ben says of its hidden author whom he knows to be Bacon ‘Of all, that insolent Greece, or haughty Rome/sent forth, or since did from their ashes come’, and uses similar phrases when referring to Bacon in Timber or Discoveries ‘he [Bacon] who hath fill’d up all numbers; and perform’d that in our tongue, which may be compar’d, or preferr’d, either to insolent Greece, or haughty Rome.’ Ben may also have contributed to, or solely composed, a poem praising Felton that brought him into dangerous contact with the Stuart regime in the powerful figure of Attorney-General Sir Robert Heath.

During the time of Felton’s imprisonment awaiting his fate a poem began circulating in secret among a few private hands, that was attributed to the Oxford scholar and cleric Zouche Townley, which stated in no uncertain terms that Felton had saved England from the Duke of Buckingham who was a clear and present danger to national security. It was published in Poems and Songs Relating to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham; and his Assassination by John Felton presented as ‘Zouch Townley’s Poem “To His Confined Friend Mr. Felton” which ‘appears only to have circulated in secret form; for the writer being summoned in the Star Chamber, and not willing to have any such poem addressed to himself escaped to the Hague.’ A few years later there appeared in The Athenaeum an article headed ‘New Facts about Ben Jonson’ that reproduced part of the poem ‘said’ to be ‘the production of Zouch Townley, an intimate companion and friend of Jonson.’ One Sunday Zouch Townley preached a sermon in the parish church of Westminster at which Jonson was present where he gave his friend a dagger ‘and it will be doing no violence to Jonson’s habits of association and composition to imagine that where he confesses to have given the dagger he may also have lent point and weight to the line.’ From a paper now turned up by Mr Bruce ‘it appears that the Court saw grounds for believing Jonson to be the true author of the lines to Felton.’ The curious examination of Ben Jonson by the Attorney-General Sir Robert Heath took place on 26 October 1629 in which rare Ben was asked whether he had ever seen a copy of the poem. After being shown a copy of it he admitted that he had seen at the Westminster house of Sir Robert Cotton which was lying around on the table. The Attorney-General asked Ben ‘had he been the author thereof’ whereupon he read the poem and denied that he had written it ‘nor did he knowe who made them, or seen or herd them before’, and nor had he made, or possessed, a copy of them. He then said he had heard of them since and being asked again whether he knew or had heard who wrote the poem Ben insisted ‘he doth not knowe, but he hath herd by commo[n] fame that one M’ Townley should make them, but he presseth truly that he can not name any one singuler p[er]son who hath soe reported it.’ Of course, his testimony is not in the least bit convincing and the suspicion still lingers that he did in fact pen the condemnation of Buckingham and eulogy to Felton. In her biography of Jonson, Professor Barton appears to do her level best to suggest rare Ben was behind it. She begins by stating ‘Whether Townley was in fact responsible for the poem ‘To his confined friend Mr felton’ remains uncertain’, and indeed writes Professor Barton ‘there is much in the poem itself that feels Jonsonian.” In the period leading up to the recorded death of his king Bacon he Jonson assisted his Rosicrucian master in translating his essays and contributing two poems to Bacon’s Shakespeare First Folio. He had seen the damage wrought on the life of Bacon by James I and the Duke of Buckingham and the way Bacon was afterwards treated by Charles I and Buckingham, who was believed with the complicity of the new king, to have poisoned the old one, from both of whom Bacon had had much to fear. The poem pointedly titled ‘To His Confined Friend’ conveys a sense of the personal about it and much of it seems to be written with real heat and feeling. He says that he dare not pray ‘Thy act may mercie finde, least thy great storie/Loose somewhat of its
miracle and glorie.’ He urges Felton to stay strong in the face of torture, before shifting it by saying, if lightening and thunder should take ‘my’ life ‘I would applause the wisdome of my fate’,108 which is reminiscent of the final line of Ben Jonson’s ode to ‘Lord Bacon’s Birthday’ written a few year earlier ‘In raising him the wisdom of my king’.109 He must now leave Felton to his death and everlasting fame whose brave act had saved the kingdom from the reviled and loathed favourite which he hoped would ring loudly down the ages to posterity:

Farewell: undaunted stand, and ioy to bee
Of publique sorrow the epitome.
Let the dukes name solace and crowne thy thrall:
All wee by him did suffer, thou for all.
And I dare boldlie write, as thou dar’st dye,
Stout Felton, Englands ransome, heere doth lye.110

An early life of the Duke of Buckingham was written by Bacon’s cousin the diplomat Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) with whom Bacon had a close relationship over several decades and with whom he regularly corresponded and sent copies of his writings and works. Wotton was part of Bacon’s inner circle and (working closely with Sir Thomas Meautys and Dr William Rawley) he composed the epitaph on Bacon’s monument at St Michael’s Church, St Albans. Questions had been asked about Felton’s true motives and whether he acted alone or was secretly set on by others. In A Short View of the Life and Death of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham he also very curiously questioned Felton’s motives ‘What may have been the immediate or greatest motive of that felonious conception, is even yet in the clouds.’111 He doubted the two motivations that Felton ‘had been stung by the deniall of his Captain’s place’ or ‘the imagination’ he resented Buckingham for favouring a man with whom Felton had ‘ancient qua[r]rells’.112 Wotton reports that only three hours before his execution Felton in a conversation with Sir Richard Gresham (Sir Thomas Gresham’s illegitimate daughter married Bacon’s half-brother Sir Nathaniel Bacon) Felton confessed ‘two only inducements’ one of them being the Remonstrance of the House of Commons and the other ‘a certain libellous book written by one Eggleston a Scottish Physitian, which made the Duke one of the foulest Monsters upon the earth’.113 But Wotton appears to have remained unconvinced. He suspected that Felton had ‘studied’ these motivations to cover his true ones ‘either to honest a deed after it was done, or to slumber his conscience in the doing’.114 The Remonstrance ‘which perchance he thought the fairest cover, so he put it in second place, whatsoever were the true motive, which I think none can determine, but the Prince of darknesse’.115 Perchance Wotton was giving some kind of hint to posterity that all was not what it seemed. Or perhaps he knew, or was privy to the secret, that other hidden forces were at work.

The tract by George Eglisham The Forerunner of Revenge written around the time of Bacon’s supposed death was one of the critical impulses that led to the assassination of the loathed and reviled Duke of Buckingham who he had directly accused of poisoning and murdering King James and other members of the nobility including the Marquis of Hamilton and Henry Wriothesley, the third Earl of Southampton. In The Forerunner of Revenge Eglisham made no direct or explicit charge against Charles I and suspicions of his complicity in his father’s murder went largely unspoken or unsaid out loud and was only vaguely hinted at or alluded to in the parliamentary proceedings and in manuscript and print, although no doubt in private many at the time considered or stated it. During the Caroline Personal Rule from 1629-40 during which time Charles 1 ruled England
without a parliament the secret history of the murder of James I was ‘muted but not forgotten’ and continued to ‘fester’ beneath ‘the superficial calm’ of the decade before the almighty storm of the English civil war exploded into life. For Norman Chevers in his little known Did James the First of England Die from the Effects of Poison or from Natural Causes Eglisham’s tract was ‘the spark igniting that train which exploded in the Great Rebellion and in the death of King Charles the First upon a scaffold at Whitehall’, eventually resulting in the destruction of his monarchical rule and the life of a king about whom it was now being said publicly was involved or complicit in the murder of his father James I:

When civil war began in England in 1642 Eglisham’s pamphlet reappeared in multiple new editions to harden the resolve of those now taking up arms against Charles I. Early in 1648, as many yearned for a negotiated settlement, radicals in the Army and Parliament used variations on the secret history not only to end negotiations with Charles but also to implicate him in his father’s death. A few months later, claims about James’s murder hung over the debates about his son’s trial. Indeed, by the time of Charles’s execution in January 1649, James’s murder had become a revolutionary shibboleth, and it figured prominently in the foundational mythology of the English Republic, repeatedly invoked by the regime’s propagandists to condemn the Stuart monarchy and defend the Free State.

2.
THE GRAND ILLUSION HIS FINAL DRAMA

According to every single one of the orthodox biographers of Francis Bacon, starting with the earliest, by Pierre Amboise, Peter Boener and Dr. William Rawley, all the way through to Spedding’s standard seven-volume Life and Letters to the recent biographies by Jardine and Stewart (1998) and Robert P. Ellis (2005), as well as the latest entry for him in the ODNB (2004-21), the great philosopher died on 9 April 1626.

The first printed account of his death appeared in a curious French edition of his Sylva Sylvarum entitled Histoire Natvrelle De M° Francois Bacon, to which is prefixed a Life of Bacon, that is conspicuously lacking in any hard facts or biographical detail:

...he again applied himself as before to unravel the great secrets of nature; and as he was engaged during a severe frost in observing some particular effects of cold, having stayed too long in the open and forgetting that his age made him incapable of bearing such severities, the cold, acting the more easily on a body whose powers were already reduced by old age, drove out all that remained of natural heat and reduced him to the last condition that is always reached by great men only to soon. Nature failed him while he was chanting her praise; this she did, perhaps, because, being miserly and hiding from us her best, she feared that at last he would discover all her treasures and make all men learned at her expense. Thus ended this great man, whom England could place alone as the equal (en parallèle avec) of the best of all the previous centuries.

Its mysterious and elusive author whoever he really was must have known Bacon (some have suggested that it was written by Bacon himself) and those close to him including Dr Rawley who it refers to, yet it does not even mention a place or date of death, for the most famous figure of the Elizabethan and Jacobean era.

The next Life of Bacon was written by Peter Boener who served as his apothecary and secretary until March 1623 when he departed for Holland leaving Bacon and his wife in good health. The Life appeared in a Dutch edition of Bacon’s Essays in 1646 and in
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its dedication to the Prince of Orange its translator Boener plainly intimates that there are things he is privy to about his former master he knows not to publicly utter or state in print:

Please do not think it strange that I offer you, as a very small proof of my duty, the writings of that very celebrated luminary, Lord Franciscus Bacon, Chancellor of England, translated into our Dutch tongue by me, formerly his servant. It is that author praised by all the world, and whose writings are to be found in several countries in several languages. But, not to let your Highness wait any longer, it is that author about whom it is better not to speak than to say too much.\(^{121}\)

In keeping with his stated *modus operandi* Boener provides us with the brief statement that Bacon died on 9 April 1626:

..it would be desirable (he having died anno 1626, on the 9\(^{th}\) April, being old 66 years) that a statue or a bronzen image were erected in his country to his honour and name, as a noteworthy example and pattern for everyone of all virtue, gentleness, peacefulness, and patience.\(^{122}\)

His first English editor and biographer Dr William Rawley who lived with Bacon for the last ten years of his recorded life from 1616 to 1626 was privy to the secrets of his Rosicrucian Master. In the 1657 edition of the collected volume of Bacon’s writings entitled *Resuscitatio, or, Bringing into Public Light Several Pieces, of the Works, Civil, Historical, Philosophical, & Theological, Hitherto Sleeping* Dr Rawley prefixed to it the first English *Life* of Bacon. In his address to the reader Dr Rawley informs the initiated ‘in regard, of the Distance, of the time, since his Lordships Dayes; whereby, I shall not tread too near, upon the Heels of Truth; Or of the Passages, and Persons; then concerned’. For as he clearly states there are secrets about Bacon that are not ‘communicable to the Publick’.\(^{123}\) In his version of Bacon’s death Dr Rawley states that he died at the Earl of Arundel’s House in Highgate near London:

*He died, on the 9\(^{th}\). Day of April, in the year: 1626; In the early Morning, of the Day, then celebrated, for our Saviours Resurrection; In the 66\(^{th}\). year of his Age; At the Earle of Arundells House, in High-gate, near London; To which Place, he casually repaired, about a week before; God so ordaining, that he should dye there: Of a Gentle Feaver, accidentally accompani'd, with a great Cold; whereby the Defluxion of Rheume, fell so plentiful upon his Breast, that he died by Suffocation.*\(^{124}\)

The antiquary and biographer John Aubrey later claimed that the political philosopher Thomas Hobbes, Bacon’s secretary and translator of a number of his essays, provided him with another version of the circumstances surrounding Bacon’s death:

Mr. Hobbs told me that the cause of his Lordship’s death was trying an Experiment; viz. as he was taking the aire in a Coach with Dr. Witherborne (a Scotchman, Physitian to the King) towards High-gate, snow lay on the ground, and it came into my Lord’s thoughts, why flesh might not be preserved in snow, as in Salt. They were resolved they would try the Experiment presently. They alighted out of the Coach and went into a ppoore woman’s house at the bottom of Highgate hill, and bought a Hen, and made the woman exenterate it, and then stuffed the body with Snow, and my Lord did help to doe it himselfe. The Snow so chilled him that he immediately fell so extremely ill, that he could not returne to his Lodging (I suppose then at Graye’s Inn) but went to the Earle of Arundel’s house at High-gate, where they putt him into the bedwarmed with a Panne, but it was a damp bed that had not been layn-in about a yeare
before, which gave him such a colde that in 2 or 3 dayes as I remember Mr. Hobbes told me, he dyed of Suffocation.125

In his brief account of Bacon in *The History of the Worthies of England* the English churchmen and historian Thomas Fuller provides no more than a single sentence about Bacon’s death ‘He died Anno Domini 1626 in the house of the Earl of Arundel at Highgate’.126 With David Lloyd in *The States-men and Favourites of England* more or less repeating Rawley ‘he dyed of a gentle Feaver, accompanied with a choaking defluxion and cold, April 9, being Easter-day 1626. 66th. year of his age in the Earl of Arundel’s house at High-gate near London.’127

In their widely critically acclaimed standard single volume biography *The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon* its authors professors Jardine and Stewart state that accounts of the circumstances surrounding a prominent death in early modern England ‘need to be taken with more than a pinch of salt’, as do the ‘carefully constructed...composite story from Amboise, ‘Hobbes’ (via Aubrey) and Rawley’,128 to which can be added the brief accounts or stories given above by Boener, Fuller and Lloyd. The precise word ‘story’ is crucial and indicative. In his brief account of Bacon’s death his standard biographer Spedding used the word ‘story’ twice: ‘The story is, that the idea suddenly occurring to him, he stopped the coach, alighted at a cottag…’ and ‘the story goes on to say that the housekeeper in his anxiety to entertain him handsomely had put him in the best bed; which, having been long unused in the absence of the family, was damp in spite of the warming-pan.”129 In his account of Bacon’s death Professor Ellis uses the word ‘story’ four times in the first paragraph,130 with the word again used by Professor Peltonen in his *Life of Bacon* in the *ODNB* ‘According to the story, in an unseasonable cold spring it had occurred to Bacon to test whether snow would preserve flesh from putrefaction, as salt does.’131 Put another way these very carefully constructed composite stories of his death are FICTIONS, as is his own written account of the circumstances leading up to it. In what is known as his last letter addressed to the future Grand Master of England the Earl of Arundel who with his fellow Grand Master of England the Earl of Pembroke and Earl of Montgomery (whom Bacon dedicated the First Folio) led the fight against Buckingham, he sets the scene, just like in one of his Shakespeare dramas:

*The Lord of St. Alburns to the Earl Marshall, with humble thanks for a favour.*

*This was the last Letter that he ever wrote.*

*My very good Lord,*

I WAS Likely to have had the fortune of Caius Plinius the Elder, who lost his life, by trying an experiment, about the burning of the Mountain Vesuvius. For I also was desirous to try an experiment or two, touching the conservation, and induration of Bodies. As for the experiment it self, it succeeded excellently well; but in the Journie (between London and Highgate) I was taken with such a fit of Casting, as I knew not, whether it were the Stone, or some Surfeit, or Cold, or indeed a touch of them all three. But when I came to your Lordships house, I was not able to go back; and therefore was forced to take up my lodging here, where your House-keeper is very carefull and diligent about me; which I assure my selfe your Lordship will not only pardon towards him, but think the better of him for it: For indeed your Lordship’s house, was happie to me; and I kisse your Noble hands for the welcome which I am sure, you give me to it, &c.

I know, how unfit it is for me to Write to your Lordship, with any other hand, than mine own; but, in troath, my fingers are so disjoynted with this fit of sicknesse, that I cannot steadily hold a Pen.132
Despite the accounts given by Amboise, Aubrey and Rawley, etc being acknowledged as carefully constructed composite stories modern orthodox Bacon biographers still to the present day simply repeat the story (often devoting only a few lines or one or two paragraphs in their accounts of his death) that he died at the Earl of Arundel’s house at Highgate on 9 April 1626.\(^\text{133}\) Whereas hidden from the rest of the world, a large number of Baconian scholars mostly in the private journal of\textit{ Baconiana}, as well as other out of the way little known publications, have for more than a century questioned, disputed and presented a whole range of evidence which undermines, confutes and overturns the last great secret of Bacon’s life—namely, his supposed death in April 1626.\(^\text{134}\)

The above letter addressed to the high ranking initiate of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood the Earl of Arundel was mysteriously not printed until 1660 and then only in \textit{A Collection Of Letters, Made By Sr Tobie Mathews} who is also strongly suspected by many to also have been a member of his Rosicrucian Brotherhood. The letter to the future Grand Master of England, who was at the time imprisoned in the Tower by King James for opposing Buckingham, ends abruptly, prompting Spedding to observe ‘it is a great pity that the editor did not think fit to print the whole,’\(^\text{135}\) meaning elements of it had been deliberately withheld and suppressed.

The letter itself or the redacted version of it is full of curiosities and anomalies. The statement that Bacon was travelling between London and Highgate would have been in contravention of one of the severe strictures made against him directed by James I and doubtless the Duke of Buckingham and endorsed by the House of Lords. The statement Bacon was carrying out an experiment touching the conservation and duration of bodies should also have given his orthodox biographers pause for thought considering he had devoted extended sections on experiments concerning freezing and the preservation of bodies in cold conditions in \textit{The History of Life and Death} and \textit{Sylva Sylvarum}. For the story to have some legs it required what Amboise described in April as a ‘severe frost’, elaborated on by Aubrey (via Hobbes) who reports that Bacon was taking the air in a coach with Dr Witherborne, the king’s physician, towards Highgate, as snow lay on the ground. Followed by an equally elaborate story that Bacon after deciding to carry out an experiment, purchased a hen and duly stuffed it with snow (presumably because in April there was a lot of snow about). The snow so chilled him that he caught a cold and ‘immediately fell so extremely ill’ he was not able to return to his abode and instead as the house of the Earl of Arundel at Highgate happened to be in the vicinity he made is way there. In Dr Rawley’s account Bacon ‘casually repaired’ there about a week before his death on 9 April, opening up the possibility it apparently occurred on 1 April, better known as April Fool’s Day, a day known for practical jokes, hoaxes and illusions. Then according to the Aubrey version of events, we are supposed to believe Dr Witherborne an experienced physician, was such an incompetent and blundering fool that he actually placed an extremely ill Bacon in a damp bed. This resulted Aubrey continues-contra the statement made by Dr Rawley-in giving him a cold (presumably a second cold) that in two or three days caused him to die of suffocation. To cap all this it will be recalled that David Lloyd in \textit{The States-men and Favourites of England} in one place also says Bacon died at Highgate, yet in another part of the same work, Lloyd contradicts himself in his \textit{Observations on the Life of Sir Julius Caesar} wherein he says ‘Sir Francis Bacon Lord Verulam was judicious in his Election, when perceiving his Dissolution to approach, he made his last Bed in effect in the house of Sir Iulius.’\(^\text{136}\) It now appears that Bacon died in two completely different locations! A slightly more elaborate version of this version was provided by Basil Montagu (whose ancestor John, second Duke of Montagu was Grand Master of England,\(^\text{137}\)) in his \textit{Life of Bacon}:
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Whether Sir Thomas Meautys or Dr. Rawley could be found does not appear; but a messenger was immediately sent to his relation, the Master of the Rolls, the charitable Sir Julius Caesar. He instantly attended his friend, who, confined to his bed, and so enfeebled that he was unable to hold a pen, could still exercise his lively fancy... He died in the arms of Sir Julius Caesar, early on the morning of Easter Sunday, the 9th of April, 1626, in the sixty-sixth year of his age.  

These contradictory devices are used by members of Bacon’s Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood to indicate to the initiated that things are not as they seem or to those in his own words that have the intellect to pierce the veil and see the truth behind the illusion. The truth of which was known to the recipient of Bacon’s so-called last letter, the Earl of Arundel a member of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood who was appointed Grand Master of England, a few years later:

THOMAS HOWARD Earl of Arundel…then succeeded [the Earl of] Danby at the Head of the Fraternity [with Inigo Jones appointed Deputy Grand Master]...

In their recent biography The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon its authors professors Jardine and Stewart suggest that rather than dying of severe cold or the like as stated by Amboise, Dr Rawley and Aubrey (Hobbes), etc, in his last days Bacon ‘tells Arundel, in a barely veiled allusion, that he has been inhaling remedial substances in London, in an attempt to alleviate the symptoms of ill-health and, he hopes, help prolong his life: a course of events which ‘succeeded excellently well’—except that on the journey home he was ‘suddenly taken violently ill with ‘a fit of casting [vomiting],’ and forced to break his journey at Arundel’s house. Here he remained, dying there shortly thereafter.'

To substantiate their interpretation that Bacon had first hand experience of opiates Jardine and Stewart reproduce a series of citations from Sylva Sylvarum where he ‘specifically’ discusses taking opiates by inhalation for the ‘prolongation of life’ and The History of Life and Death in which Bacon also gives a list of ‘opiates’. In The History of Life and Death through the sections numbered 14 to 37 Bacon discusses in some detail the varying uses and effects of opium and opiates ‘Opium is by far the most powerful and effectual means for condensing the spirits by flight; and next to it opiates and soporifics [a substance that induces drowsiness or sleep] in general’, further adding ‘let no one wonder at the variety of its use’. Writing decades earlier the prolific Baconian Parker Woodward anticipated them and agreed that Bacon in his ‘last’ letter to his Rosicrucian—Freemasonry Brother the Earl of Arundel in a scarcely veiled allusion hints at taking opiates, whereas he arrived at a completely different conclusion:

Putting this fragmentary information together, it would appear that Bacon planned to simulate death at Highgate, and that the experiment which he said in the Arundel letter nearly cost him his life was the induration of his own body by opium. As seemingly dead he was most probably shown to the caretaker, and possibly to others, by his friendly medical men and Sir Julius Caesar. While in the shell or rough coffin in which his touched spirit was retreating he, as may be assumed, nearly did die. At some friendly house he would have been restored to health. Then he went abroad as secretly as possible.

In Reminiscences of a Baconian Kate Prescott an avid researcher into the authorship of the Shakespeare works and owner of twelve copies of Arcadia (attributed to Sir Philip Sidney who they believed was a mask for Bacon) tells how her husband Dr Prescott deciphered the following statement by Bacon enciphered in one of their original copies of it:
Fearing for my life lest King Charles should kill me, I feigned death, being put to sleep with opium. I was sewn in a sheet and taken to St Michael’s Church where I was found seventeen long hours later by Sir Thomas Meautys who brought me back to life by the injection of nightshade into my rectum. I escaped from England dressed as a serving maid of Lady Delaware.445

Something similar is described by Bacon in *Romeo and Juliet*:

```
Take thou this vial, being then in bed,
And this distilling liquor drink thou off,
When presently through all thy veins shall run
A cold and drowsy humour; for no pulse
Shall keep his native progress, but surcease.
No warmth, no breath shall testify thou livest.
The roses in thy lips and cheeks shall fade
To wanny ashes, they eyes’ windows fall
Like death when he shuts up the day of life.
Each part, deprived of supple government,
Shall, stiff and stark and cold, appear like death;
And in this borrowed likeness of shrunk death
Thou shall continue two-and-forty hours,
And then awake as from a pleasant sleep.
[Romeo and Juliet: 4:1:93-106]
```

On her informative website (https://rosbarber.com/shakespeare-characters-wrongly-believed-dead/#comment-139240) as indicated Dr Ros Barber presented a list of ‘33 Shakespeare Characters Wrongly Believed To Be Dead’:

**DELIBERATELY FAKED DEATHS**

1. Juliet (*Romeo & Juliet*)
2. Hero (*Much Ado About Nothing*)
3. Helena (*All’s Well That Ends Well*)
4. Hermione (*The Winter’s Tale*)
5. Falstaff (*1 Henry IV*) *
6. Claudio (*Measure for Measure*) *
7. Innogen (*Cymbeline*) *
   (*Deaths faked to avoid actual death).*

**ASSUMED DEAD, BUT ALIVE**

8. Julia (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*)
9. Antipholus of Ephesus (*The Comedy of Errors*)
10. Dromio of Ephesus (*The Comedy of Errors*)
11. Antipholus of Syracuse (*The Comedy of Errors*)
12. Dromio of Syracuse (*The Comedy of Errors*)
13. Egeon (*The Comedy of Errors*)
14. Emilia (*The Comedy of Errors*)
15. Thisbe (*A Midsummer Night’s Dream*)
16. Henry IV (*2 Henry IV*)
In an article Dr Barber incisively identifies ‘Shakespeare’s obsession with false death and resurrection’. She is undoubtedly correct in her observation. The true author of the Shakespeare plays had a profound and enduring interest in the subject of death. This is reflected in Bacon’s essay Of Death, and his two full-length treatises on the subject—the first of these the little known An Inquiry concerning the Ways of Death the Postponing of Old Age, and the Restoring of the Vital Powers, and secondly, The History of Life and Death, first published in the same years as the Shakespeare First Folio in 1623.

The above examples were added to by one of Dr Barber’s correspondents, including the interesting example of the titular character in Timon of Athens, who is reported dead and leaves behind an inscription written by him because he wanted people to believe he was dead.

The play Timon of Athens as we have it was written and revised after Bacon’s fall in 1621 which dramatically reflects the events surrounding his life and circumstances. It was first published in the 1623 Shakespeare First Folio and anticipated or reflected his own future plans for feigning his own death a few years later.

In his last will published on 19 December 1625 in the presence of his first editor Dr William Rawley Bacon expressed a desire to be buried in St. Michael’s Church ‘For my burial, I desire it may be in St. Michael’s church, near St. Alban’s: there was my mother buried, and it is the parish church of my mansion house at Gorhambury, and it is the only Christian church within the walls of old Verulam. I would have the charge of my funeral not to exceed three hundred pounds at the most.’

There could not be a more appropriate setting for this grand Rosicrucian-Freemasonic illusion. According to the central legend of Freemasonry the craft was introduced into England in the time of St Alban who lived in the 3rd century, from whom the town of St Albans takes its name, after whom Lord Bacon took his title Viscount St Alban. Old Verulam is the site of the old Roman town of Verulamium and within the city walls of the old city of Verulam Bacon built Verulam House, within the grounds of his Gorhambury estate, which may have been used as an early Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Lodge. The ‘Legend of St Alban’ is presented as follows by Dr Anderson in the official The New Book of Constitutions of the Antient and Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons:
The joint emperors Dioclesian and Maximian employ’d Carausius as their Admiral against the Saxon Pirates, who being at Peace with the Picts, and gaining the Army, put on the Purple and was own’d by the other Two. A. D. 287.

Carausius encouraged the Craft, particularly at Verulam, (now St. Albans, Hertfordshire) by the worthy knight Albanus, who afterwards turn’d Christian, and was call’d St. Alban, (the Proto Martyr in Britain under the Dioclesian Persecution) whom Carausius employ’d (as the old Constitutions affirm) to inviron that City with a Stone Wall, and to build him a fine Palace; for which that British King made St. Alban the Steward of his Household and chief Ruler of the Realm.

St. Alban loved Masons well, and cherished them much…He also obtained of the King a Charter for the Free Masons, for to hold a general Council, and gave it the name of Assembly, and was thereat himself as Grand Master, and helped to make Masons, and gave them good Charges, &c.

When Dioclesian and Maximian abdicated, A. D. 303.

The legend of St Alban, the supposed founder of Freemasonry in England, as presented by Dr Anderson is framed by two numbers 287 and 303. If the null ‘0’ is dropped from 303 it leaves 33 Bacon in simple cipher and the number 287 represents Fra Rosicrosse in kay cipher. Thus Dr James Anderson in The New Book of Constitutions of the Antient and Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, officially sanctioned by the Grand Lodge of England, secretly communicates to the high initiates and those able to decipher it that the true founding father of the Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood is Francis Bacon, Viscount St Alban.

In the first English Life of Bacon, written by his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brother Dr William Rawley, who lived with him for the last ten years of his recorded life, he tells the rest of the world and posterity, his Grand Master Lord Bacon,

…was buried, in Saint Michaels Church, at Saint Albas; Being the Place, designed for his Buriall, by his last Will, and Testament; Both because, the Body, of his Mother, was interred there; And because; it was the onely Church, then remaining, within the Precincts, of old Verulam: Where he hath a Monument, erected for him, of White Marble; (By the Care, and Gratitude, of Sir Thomas Meautys, Knight, formerly his Lordships Secretary; Afterwards Clark, of the Kings Honourable Privy Counsell, under two Kings;) Representing his full Pourtraiture, in the Posture, of Studying; with an Inscription, composed, by that Accomplisht Gentleman, and Rare Wit, Sir Henry Wotton.

In following Dr Rawley both Thomas Fuller and David Lloyd also state that Bacon was buried at St Michael’s Church in old Verulam, with a monument erected for him by his private secretary Sir Thomas Meautys and Sir Henry Wotton.

There is however no documentation, nor account or report of his funeral or burial and the register for the entry for burials at St Michael’s Church prior to 1643 are missing. Transcripts of them are preserved in the Archdeaconry Court of St Alban’s Abbey from 1572 to 1600 and from 1629 to 1630 which omits the year Bacon is said to have been buried at St Michael’s Church. Nor is there any item for funeral expenses in the Accounts of Administration of Bacon’s Estate. There is also no mention of his funeral in any contemporary works, documents, letters, diaries, or a single report from any one whatsoever who attended the funeral of the greatest and arguably the most famous man of the period.

It is reported by Hamon L’Estrange in The Reign of King Charles (1656) that when Sir Thomas Meautys died in 1649 that during his funeral in St Michael’s Church ‘it was his lot to be inhumed so nigh his Lord’s sepulchre that in forming his grave, part of the Viscount’s body was exposed to view which being spyed by a Doctor of Physick, he
demanded the head to be given him, and did most shamefully disport himself with that shell which was somewhat the continent of so vast treasure of knowledge.' This was presumably the source of Thomas Fuller’s in The History of the Worthies Of England (1662) ‘I have read that his grave being occasionally opened, his scull, (the relique of civil veneration) was by one King a Doctor of Physick made the object of scorn and contempt, but he, who then derided the dead, is since become the laughing stock of the living.’

After Bacon’s supposed death following a series of complex legal manoeuvres Sir Thomas Meautys gained ownership of his estate at Gorhambury. He married Anne Bacon, daughter of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, son of Francis’s elder half-brother Sir Nicolas Bacon in 1639 and the couple retired to Gorhambury in 1642. Following the death of Sir Thomas Meautys in 1649 the Bacon estates passed to his brother Henry Meautys. In 1651 his widow Anne Bacon Meautys married Sir Harbottle Grimston, a future Speaker of the House of Commons and Master of the Rolls who, purchased Gorhambury from Henry Meautys, and their descendants have occupied the Hertfordshire Bacon family estate to the present day. According to John Aubrey a few decades later ‘This October 1681, it rang over all St. Albans that Sir Harbottle Grimston, Master of the Rolles, had removed the Coffin of this most renowned Lord Chancellour to make roome for his owne to lye in the vault there at St Michael’s church.’ There was however, observes Parker Woodward ‘plenty of room in the crypt for many bodies, so the report was most probably to account for the absence of Bacon’s coffined corpse from St Michael’s Church.’ These self-evidently absurd statements were all part of the same carefully constructed charade to maintain the illusion that Bacon died in 1626 followed by his funeral and burial at St Michael’s Church.

There was no funeral or burial at St Michael’s Church in 1626. When the vaults were examined hundred of years later nothing was found of Bacon’s coffin and remains in St Michael’s Church. A statement confirming this was provided by the Earl of Verulam to C. M. Pott as printed in the 1904 edition of Baconiana:

I received a most positive assurance from the late Earl of Verulam, at Gorhambury, that Francis St. Alban was not, as had been supposed, buried in the vaults of the Church of St Michael’s. Those vaults were thoroughly examined by himself and a party of experts, and every coffin was seen and identified before the final bricking up of these crypts by order of the Board of Works. “Bacon was certainly not buried there.”

In researching his work Francis Bacon (Edinburgh University Press, 1992) Professor Coquillette prefices it with a rather delightful account of his visit to Gorhambury. He was met at the entrance of the estate by the gatekeeper and on his long walk up to the house, the estate’s gamekeeper. He was aware that the life and writings of Bacon were entangled in controversy and mystery and that ‘even the place of his burial is shrouded in mystery’. He also benefited by bumping into a parishioner of St Michael’s Church:

It was she who first told me that Bacon was not buried where he was supposed to be. Bacon’s last will, certainly stipulated that he be buried at St Michael’s, and for many years it was assumed that he lay under his monument in the north wall of the chancel. Recent repairs to that wall, however, have revealed that Bacon is not there.

The same is also repeated by professors Jardine and Stewart in The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon, who like Professor Coquillette were either ignorant of the information as cited above by C. M. Pott and afterwards found in numerous other later Baconiana articles and full-length Baconian biographies, that Bacon was not buried there, or they did not for some reason wish to draw attention to these accounts:
…no record exists of his burial, and it has recently been revealed that Bacon is not buried under the monument in the north wall of the chancel, as had been assumed.

In the course of her researches for the groundbreaking *Francis Bacon A Biography* (1981) Jean Overton Fuller also visited Gorhambury. She was aided in her inquiries by the Countess of Verulam and the Earl of Verulam’s secretary Norah King. One of the important matters she raised with them was the question of just where Bacon was actually buried. His coffin they informed her was not as previously believed under the statue erected by Sir Thomas Meautys and the family were (contra Dr Rawley, Fuller and Lloyd, *et al*) adamant Bacon was never interred in St Michael’s Church:

….it has not been possible to ascertain the place of Bacon’s burial. It used to be thought it was under the statue erected to him by Meautis in St. Michaels, Gorhambury, but recent excavations revealed there was no coffin. The inscription reads not “hic jacet” but “sic sedebat” and the present Verulam family are adamant he was never interred there. The relevant page from the burial register is missing and it has not been possible to discover any reference to his funeral.

The monument of Bacon at St Michael’s Church was erected by his private secretary and member of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood Sir Thomas Meautys replete with an epitaph written by his cousin Sir Thomas Wotton, of the English Secret Service and also a member of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood:

```
FRANCISCVS BACON BARO DE VERVLAM S'I ALBANI VIC

SEV NOTIORIBVS TITVLIS

SCIENTIARVM LVMEN FACVNDIAE LEX

SIC SEDEBAT

QVI POSTQVAM OMNIA NATVRALIS SAPIENTIAE

ET CIVILIS ARCANA EVOLVISSET

NATVRAE DECRETVM EXPLEVIT

COMPOSITA SOLVANTVR

AN° DNI MDC XXVI

AETATīs LXVI

TANTI VIRI

MEM

THOMAS MEAVTVS

SVPERSTITIS CVLTOR
```
The majority of Bacon’s papers, letters and literary manuscripts in the possession of Dr Rawley were passed to his second editor Thomas Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. He was familiar with the secrets of Bacon’s life and writings, including his authorship of the Shakespeare works, his cipher systems, as well as being privy to the truth about his supposed death. In his *Baconiana, Or Certain Remains of Sir Francis Bacon* Dr Tenison, a member of Bacon’s Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood, gives a translation of the Latin epitaph as follows:

Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St. Albans:
Or in more conspicuous Titles;
The Light of the Sciences, the Law of Eloquence,
sate on this manner.
Who, after he had unfolded all the Mysteries
of Natural Science and Civil Wisdom
obeyed the Decree of nature.
*Let the Companions be parted, *
in the Year of our Lord 1626,
and the sixty sixth year of his Age.

Thomas Meautys, a Reverencer of him
whilst Alive, and an Admirer of him
now Dead, hath set up this to the
Memory of so great a Man.161

It is not known who designed and built the Bacon monument at St Michael’s Church though it has been suggested that in all likelihood it was carried out by the sculptor and Master Mason Nicholas Stone, a senior figure in the Mason’s Company of London. He carried out as Master Mason several designs of Bacon’s close friend Grand Master of England Inigo Jones including the Banqueting House at Whitehall. When Inigo Jones was first appointed Grand Master of England his two appointed Grand Wardens were ‘William Herbert Earl of Pembroke, and Nicholas Stone the Sculptor’.162 When the Earl of Pembroke was chosen as the Grand Master of England in 1618 Inigo Jones was appointed his Deputy-Grand Master and he was still sitting in Solomon’s Chair when Bacon jointly dedicated the Shakespeare First Folio to Pembroke and his brother Philip Herbert, the Earl of Montgomery. The Earl of Pembroke demitted in 1630 and he was followed in quick succession by Henry, Earl of Danby and then Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel as Grand Master of England in whose house Bacon supposedly died, with Inigo Jones serving as his Deputy-Grand Master.163 There seems every chance that Inigo Jones and Nicholas Stone were directly involved in the design and construction of the Bacon monument at St Michael’s Church. The translation by Tenison of ‘Composita Solvantur’ as ‘Let the Companions be parted’,164 alludes to the Freemasonic Royal Arch Companion where members of the Order are referred to as ‘Excellent Companions’. The enigmatic figure of Bacon on the monument at St Michael’s Church depicts him as Grand Master of the Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood. In his biography of Bacon, Alfred Dodd, himself a learned and life-long Freemason, observes:
The statue depicts Francis Bacon in a favourite attitude, seated in his chair ruminating and about to dictate: “Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin.” The Roses on his shoes denote his connection with the Rosicrucian Fraternity: the Square Chair, the Gauntlets, the Hat, as a Worshipful Master among Masons.  

Fig. 1 An Engraving of the Francis Bacon Monument at St Michael’s Church from the 1671 Resuscitatio
In the months following Bacon’s supposed death to the world his private secretary and Rosicrucian Brother Dr Rawley compiled and published a commemorative work in his honour *Memoriae honoratissimi Domini Francisci, Baronis de Verulumo, vice-comitis Sancti Albani sacrum*, otherwise known as the *Manes Verulamiani*. This rare volume contains thirty-two Latin verses in praise of Bacon with an introduction by Rawley. The orthodox editors and biographers of Bacon have continued to suppress and pass over the contents of this critically important work to the present day. Several of these verses portray Bacon as a secret supreme poet and dramatist of comedies and tragedies written under the pseudonym Shakespeare. As revealing as these remarkable verses already are in his address to the reader Dr Rawley plainly states that he had deliberately withheld other verses from public view consistent with his later statement in the preface to the *Resuscitatio* in which he stated there are some things that are not openly ‘communicable to the Publick’.

What my Lord the right Honourable Viscount St. Alban valued most, that he should be dear to seats of learning and to men of letters, that (I believe) he has secured; since these tokens of love and memorials of sorrow prove how much his loss grieves their heart. And indeed with no stinted hand have the Muses bestowed on him this emblem (for very many poems, and the best too, I withhold from publication); but since he himself delighted not in quantity, no great quantity have I put forth. Moreover let it suffice to have laid, as it were, these foundations in the name of the present age; this fabric (I think) every age will embellish and enlarge; but to what age it is given to put the last touch, that is known to God only and the fates.

It is obvious enough from the above statement that Rawley was privy to the secrets of the life of his Rosicrucian Master Lord Bacon and as can be seen from these verses alone that he knew he was the supreme poet and dramatist Shakespeare. In the verses and his subsequent first English *Life* of Lord Bacon he had in his own words laid the foundations and it would be for future generations to fill in the gaps and bring to light the secrets of his life and writings and of his feigned death by the slow degree through hints, allusions, and coded information by his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood, as stated on the title page of *New Atlantis* ‘Tempore Patet Occulta Veritas’ (In Time The Hidden Truth Will Be Revealed). Now while Dr Rawley and some of the writers of these verses could not openly state that Bacon had feigned his own death through pointed hints and double entendre, it seems at least some of them, were aware he was still alive.

It was planned and put out that Bacon died on Easter Sunday, as Dr Rawley aware of its hidden significance put it, ‘then celebrated, for our Saviours Resurrection’. This being a patently clear reference to the fact that on Easter or Resurrection Sunday Jesus Christ rose from the dead, thus in other words, Bacon died to the profane world and metaphorically rose again, and rather than ascend to heaven, he secretly slipped away to live the rest of his life in secret and obscurity. In a memorial verse penned by his inward friend the metaphysical poet George Hebert, kinsman of William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke Grand Master of England and Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, to whom Bacon dedicated the Shakespeare First Folio, in an allusion to his feigned death writes ‘It is evident in April alone you could have died’. In the poetical words of the poet and dramatist Thomas Randolph ‘Thus the new-born-Phoenix regards the ashes from which it springs, and the bloom of youth returns to aged Aeson. So too, Verulam restored, boasts its new walls, and thence hopes for its ancient renown.’ The phoenix being the long-lived immortal bird, a symbol of renewal and rebirth, that rises from its ashes and is born again, one beloved by his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood. In what appears to be an allusion to the fact that Bacon was not buried in St Michael’s
Church another anonymous author writes ‘Think you, foolish traveller, that the leader of the choir of the Muses and of Phoebus is interred in the cold marble? Away you are deceived.’ And Henry Ockley, of Trinity College, Cambridge emphatically states:

He is gone, he is gone: it suffices for my woe to have uttered this: I have not said he is dead.

In The Second Part Of The Resuscitatio Or a Collection of several pieces of the Works of the Right Honourable Francis Bacon gathered up by Dr Rawley published a few years after his death, there appears a very curious address to the reader signed by Charles Molloy. In it its author appears to suggest that Bacon had not died when the world believed he had, but instead Bacon secretly slipped away and disappeared from view into the shade, i.e., away from prying eyes, where he remained triumphant and free from the clutches of tyrants and kings, and actually died at a much later date:

And though to live at another man's benevolence seems the smallest privilege of a Subject, and to dye at his own command the greatest Prerogative of a King, yet a base Heads-man shall not share so great a glory, as the Chopping of a Head enriched with so much policy and wisdome, but rather Justice her self shall seem to entreat no other hands in his stately execution then his Royal Master's mercy; which he no sooner besought but obtained, and then with a head filled up to the brim, as well with sorrow as wisdome, and covered and adorned with gray hairs, made a holy humble retreat to the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune, till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest.

There are also some virtually unknown letters which are of inestimable value to the matter at hand that serve to indicate and confirm that Bacon did not die in 1626. The truth of his death was known to certain members of his trusted inner circle and high initiates of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood. One of those persons we might well expect to be in the secret and have knowledge of it was his lifelong inward friend Sir Tobie Matthew whom Bacon famously described as his ‘alter ego’ or other self. He acted in Bacon’s revealing dramatic device Of Love and Self-Love presented to Elizabeth for the festivities celebrating her accession day in 1595. He performed the role of the squire and shared with Bacon a love of drama and literature. In 1599 he was admitted to Gray’s Inn where Bacon mainly resided in quarters built by his father Sir Nicholas Bacon. He was the eldest son of Tobie Matthew, Archbishop of York and grew up in a religious environment and later showed an interest in politics. Due to the good offices of Bacon he was returned MP for St Albans in 1604. Later that year Matthew obtained a licence to travel abroad for three years visiting The Hague before travelling to Italy where he converted to the Roman Catholic faith. Bacon held a high view of his literary judgement and whether Matthew was in England or on the continent Bacon sent him copies of his works for comment and criticism. While Matthew was staying at the Spanish court he sent him a copy of his Advancement of Learning and a deliberately unspecified ‘little work of my recreation’, before adding in guarded and coded language ‘Those works of the Alphabet are in my opinion of less use to you where you are now, than at Paris; and therefore I conceived that you had sent me a kind of tacit countermand of your former request.’ The little work of his recreation referred to by Bacon was probably one of his Shakespeare plays and what the works of his alphabet may have been observes his standard editor and biographer Spedding ‘I cannot guess; unless they related to Bacon’s [bi-literary] cipher….It is not impossible that a man in Matthew’s position may have needed a safe cipher, and may have
needed it more at Paris than in Italy or Spain." Interestingly, the word ‘recreation’ has a numerical value of 103 in simple cipher which is the same numerical value of Shakespeare a dual cryptic reference that was not lost on Tobie Matthew. In Bacon’s Promus of Formularies and Elegances (private note-book) that contains 1655 entries of single words, phrases and sentences, etc several hundred of which were used in his Shakespeare plays entry no. 516 reads ‘Ijsdem e’literis efficitur tragedia et comedía’ (‘Tragedies and comedies are made of one alphabet’). Their secret and cryptic correspondence continued for the ten years Matthew spent abroad from 1607 to May 1617 when he returned to England and went to live with Bacon at Gorhambury. Later the same year Matthew provided the epistle dedicatory to the Duke of Genoa prefixed to an Italian version of Bacon’s Essays entitled Saggi Morali Del Signore Francesco Bacono, Cavaglide Ingleses. In a letter dated 11 March 1622 in which some degree of secrecy is required Bacon refers to his essay Of Friendship which he dedicated to Matthew when adding to his other essays in the 1625 edition:

Good Mr. Matthew,

It is not for nothing that I have deferred my essay De Amicitia, whereby it hath expected the proof of your great friendship towards me. Whatesoever the event be (wherein I depend upon God, who ordaineth the effect, the instrument, all) yet your incessant thinking of me, without loss of moment of time, or a hint of occasion, or a circumstance of endeavour, or a stroke of a pulse, in demonstration of love and affection to me, doth infinitely tie me to you. Commend my service to [my friend], The rest to-morrow, for I hope to lie at London; ever being

Your most affectionate and assured friend.

Secrecy I need not recommend. Otherwise than that you may be pleased to recommend it over to [our friend]; both because it preventeth opposition, and because it is both the King’s and my Lord Marquis’s [i.e. Buckingham] nature to love to things unexpected.

One of aspect of secrecy that passed between Bacon and Sir Tobie Matthew was his concealed authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. There are a number of letters written by Sir Tobie Matthews which allude to some of Bacon’s Shakespeare plays and in a postscript to an undated letter from this period he describes Bacon as

The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship’s name, though he be known by another.

Negotiations were still in progress for the proposed marriage of Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta and early in the summer of 1623 King James despatched Matthew to Madrid to assist and advise Charles and Buckingham ‘and being in good favour with Buckingham, intimate both with Digby and Gondomar, and more acceptable to the Spanish Court because he was a Roman Catholic’, observes Spedding, he ‘became for Bacon a valuable channel of communication.’ For his beloved and secretly inward friend Bacon included for Matthew is revised essay Of Friendship in the 1625 edition of his Essays and in his last will and testament he bequeathed him a special token of his affection ‘I give to my ancient good friend Sir Toby Matthews, some ring, to be bought for him, of the value of thirty pounds.’ In the years following the supposed death of his hero Bacon, with whom he shared many secrets, Sir Tobie Matthew spent much time in the company of Sir Kenelm Digby, a Bacon disciple and member of his Rosicrucian Brotherhood. Later in 1640 a spy named Habernfeld disclosed to William Boswell, Ambassador to The Hague, and a member of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood, who Bacon instructed in last will to take care of all his Latin and English writings, a
curious claim implicating Matthew in a Jesuit plot to murder King Charles,184 whom many believed was implicated in the poisoning by Buckingham of his father James I, and whom Bacon apparently feared wanted to kill him, prompting his feigned death.

Five years after his own death A Collection Of Letters, Made By Sir Tobie Mathews K’ with a epistle dedicatory prefixed to it by John Donne was published in 1660. For reasons of secrecy Sir Tobie Matthew went to a good deal of trouble to deliberately remove dates and names, and other particulars which may have served to identify the persons spoke of in the letters as well as to obscure their content and import:

The majority of the letters, down to page 295, consist of correspondence between Bacon and Matthew. They would have possessed greater historical interest and value, if they had not suffered so severely from editorial manipulation. The first twenty-four letters, occupying fifty-seven pages, are acknowledged as Bacon’s, though only twelve of them are addressed to Sir Tobie, who, in all cases, omits his own name. The remaining letters which can only by supposition be regarded as Bacon’s to Sir Tobie, or vice versa, are anonymous, and so altered, as to make it difficult to decide their authorship, from internal evidence only. Moreover, they are printed hap-hazard without reference to date. This disregard of chronological order may be the result of design, rather than of accident, in order to conceal more effectually the identity of the writers.185

There are a number of letters in this collection which may have been written by Bacon to Sir Tobie Matthew and vice versa after he travelled abroad following his ‘death’ to the profane world. One of these stripped of the names of all persons and particulars, that is written in Bacon’s recognisable prose style, begins ‘I confesse myself to have been rather confounded, than comforted, by your noble, and kind Letter; which did so very gallantlie prevent, and surprize me’ before proceeding to say ‘as for the Politicall, or Moral’ [the same words used in the various titles of his Essays, i.e. civil, political and moral], ‘I dare not speak a word and I wish, I had not cause so much as to think of it’, followed by:

A. B. was wont to tell me still, (when I was alive,) that he prayed God to make me an honest man, but you must desire him now, to alter his Prayer; for I find my self alreadie, to be so honest, that I am the worst for it.186

With the statement ‘WHEN I WAS ALIVE’ clearly implying that he had died to the rest of the world, in what may be described as his first death, but was clearly still very much alive, evidenced by the fact of writing this letter!

The vast majority of Bacon’s letters and manuscripts were entrusted to his private secretary and Rosicrucian Brother Dr Rawley (c.1588-1667) by whom were they were edited and published (those communicable to the public) in a series of editions that culminated in several editions of the Resuscitatio in 1657, 1661, and two posthumous editions in 1670 and 1671. On his death Bacon’s letters and manuscripts passed to his fellow Rosicrucian Brother Thomas Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury (1636-1715), some of which he made use of in the Baconiana. Or Certain Remains Of Sir Francis Bacon,...Now the First Time faithfully Published set forth to the world in 1679. In his capacity as Archbishop of Canterbury while he resided at Lambeth Palace Edmund Gibson (1669-1748), afterwards Bishop of London, was appointed chaplain and librarian to the archbishop and assigned him the responsibility of arranging all the Bacon letters and manuscripts into some kind of order. There resides in the Lambeth Library among the Gibson MSS a little known letter written by Sir Thomas Meautys to Bacon of the utmost historical importance revealing that Bacon did not die in 1626
and was alive many years after his supposed death. The letter (‘MS. Gibson, Lambeth Lib, 936, fol. 252’) was printed by his editor Basil Montagu (whose ancestor it will be recalled was Grand Master of England) in the last two pages of the twelfth volume of his sixteen volume edition of *The Works of Francis Bacon* in 1830 here reproduced in full:

T. Meautys to Lord St Alban.

My all honoured Lord,

Upon the first reading of your lordship’s, received this day, I had almost put pen to paper to ask your pardon for having (as I supposed) too rudely broken open a letter intended to another, some more deserving friend or servant of yours (for, by the infinite disproportion between the noble favours therein expressed, and my disability any way to merit, I could not otherwise conjecture); but, upon second cogitations, remembering it to be incident to heroic natures and spirits to measure out and confer their graces and favours according to the latitude and dimensions of their own noble and capacious hearts, and not according to the narrower span and scantling of others’ merits; and calling to mind that this is not the first time by many, that your lordship hath pointed me out an instance hereof, by your singular and accumulate favours, I come now, instead of asking a pardon for a supposed error of my own, to render unto your lordships all humble acknowledgement for a wilful or rather, willing error of yours, in so overprizing the poor endeavours of your unprofitable servant.

Next, I take leave to say somewhat of what we say here, arising as well from abroad as at home; viz. that, upon later and more certain advertisement out of Germany, it is found the blow given to the imperialists was far greater, both for numbers, being at least 20,000 and for the quality of the persons, than was first reported. Tilly himself being mortally wounded, and escaping to a town called Holverstat, some miles distant, was pursued by the King of Sweden, who, being advertised that he was dead, and that his body was newly taken thence, to be conveyed by a guard of 1500 horse to the Duke of Bavier’s court, instantly went after them, and in a few hours overtook them, defeated the whole troops, and brought back the corpse to Holverstat, where it remains in the town house, a spectacle of the divine revenge and justice, for the bloody execution of Mackdeburgh. On Sunday, at Hampton Court, the States’ ambassador here resident, at a solemn and public audience in the presence, sung us in effect an old song to a new tune, for his errand was only a formal relation of the passages of that achievement and defeat in the Low Countries (wherein, by the way, I heard not any mention at all of my Lord Craven’s prowess, though some say he expects a room in the next Gazette). The ambassador in magnifying of the victory, when he had said as we thought enough, concluded with that which was more than all he had said before; namely, in resembling it, both for the extent of the design, the greatness and expense in the preparation and manner of the deliverance, to that of the invasion in eighty-eight. At home we say, Mr. Attorney General is past hope of being Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, for he is assured of it; and, by the like reason, my Lord Richardson is past all fear of being removed to the King’s Bench. The attorney’s place is now in competition only between Noye and Banks, for Sir John Finch is out at all, and Banks is the likeliest to carry it. St. George was less beholden this year than ever, either to the lords of the order or to the other lords, there being only present those in the margin. So, praying your lordship to believe that I have more room in my heart than in my paper for my devotion and service to your lordship, my most honoured lord and lady, and all my noble ladies and especial friends, I rest,

Your Lordship’s to serve you,

October 11th.

T. M.

Your commands to Mr. Maxwell I performed at Windsor on Monday was sevennight. Pardon this scribble for my candle winks upon me to hasten to an end, and my maid Mary is a bed and in her first sleep, and very wayward if she be waked.

Lord Chamberlain.  Lord Treasurer.
Lord Marshal.  Lord Lindsey.
The letter preserved in the Bacon collection at the Lambeth Palace Library signed T. M., written in the handwriting of Sir Thomas Meautys headed by Bacon’s editor Basil Montagu to Bacon (“Thomas Meautys to Lord St Alban”) is in the MS not addressed to its recipient by name. Yet it requires little difficulty to demonstrate that the letter (as headed and presented by Montagu as written by Meautys to Bacon) was written in fact to his Rosicrucian Master, Bacon.

Firstly, let us look at the date of the letter. It will be noticed that the letter is only dated 11 October but its internal evidence shows the year to have been 1631 since the sacking of the Protestant city of Magdeburg by the imperial forces of the Catholic League under the command of Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly took place on 20 May 1631 resulting reportedly in the death of around 20,000 men. In revenge for this Sir Thomas Meautys relates the current news from Germany of a great battle in which Tilly himself was mortally wounded and pursued by the King of Sweden. The defeat of Tilly occurred at the Battle of Breitenfeld on 17 September 1631 by the Protestant forces led by Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden. This proves beyond all doubt that the letter was written on 11 October 1631.

It is immediately clear that an air and circumstance of secrecy surrounds the letter. Meautys begins by saying that he had broken open a letter which he initially feared was intended for someone else. This clearly indicates the letter to Meautys did not carry his name and he only became aware it was meant for him when he opened it and the same circumstances necessitated that the precaution that he did not openly address his letter to his Rosicrucian Master, Francis Bacon, Lord St. Alban.

The contents of the letter are just what we might expect from Sir Thomas Meautys writing to his Lord of St. Alban (the mythical founder of Freemasonry) while living in secret abroad. All his life Bacon had been a man of the law successively serving as Solicitor-General, Attorney-General, Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor of England. In the letter his devoted servant and private secretary Sir Thomas Meautys informs him of the chances of the candidates for some of the high legal offices. Sir Robert Heath, then Attorney-General (a creature of the Duke of Buckingham) was made Lord Chief Justice on 26 October 1631 and Sir Thomas Richardson appointed Chief Justice of the King’s Bench on 24 October 1631, both of them well-known to Bacon. As for his prediction as to the position of the Attorney-General he states that Sir John Finch is out of the running. Sir John Finch was a prominent member of Gray’s Inn who from 1614 was patronized by Bacon. He defended Bacon in his impeachment trial in 1621 and was appointed by Bacon as an executor of his estate in his 1621 will in which Bacon bequeathed him his chambers at Gray’s Inn. Throughout his legal and political career as Speaker of the House of Commons and afterwards as the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas he worked tirelessly trying to advance Bacon’s programme for law reform. His predication that Banks would most probably secure the position of Attorney-General was consistent with everyone else’s expectation at the time but it so turned out that on 27 October it was awarded to William Noye (1577-1634). He too by 1614 had attracted the attention of Bacon, then Attorney-General, who nominated him an official recorder for the Courts of Common Law. Under Bacon’s supervision
Noye was appointed to a committee of distinguished lawyers and judges to undertake a comprehensive review of English Statute law as part of Bacon’s broader programme for law reform. It is also clear from the letter that Bacon had been in regular contact with a ‘Mr. Maxwell’ who was acting at Bacon’s unknown direction which Meautys was privy to, which as he tells us, he performed at Windsor. This Mr Maxwell is an obscure figure whose identity is uncertain. He is most likely to be the Mr. Maxwell referred to in a letter held at Lambeth Palace Library (Gibson Papers, vol. viii. f. 237) on the back of which in Meautys hand as dictated by Bacon is the line ‘Mr. Maxwell. That I am sorry, that so soon as I came to know him, and to be beholding to him, I wanted power to be of use to him.’ All of which provides conclusive evidence of it being addressed to Bacon and that he was well and truly alive in 1631.

While he was living in retreat (to use the words of Molloy) several Baconians have pointed to a number of works or literary ventures abroad which Bacon was involved in the preparation, writing, revision, and publication. Parker Woodward believes that in 1629-30 he was busy preparing the French edition of his *Sylva Syylarum* printed in 1631, the same year Sir Thomas Meautys wrote the above letter to Lord St Alban, suggesting that at the time Bacon may have been in Paris, living incognito with one or more members of his Rosicrucian Brotherhood. This 1631 edition contained the first ever Life of Bacon, although a number of Baconians have suggested it was written by Bacon himself. Its translator Granville C. Cunningham observes ‘Parts of the work are so intimate and so introspective that the thought has come to me that I was dealing-not with Pierre Vamboise or with “D. M.” but with Bacon’s own “Apologia pro Vita Sua” [apology for his life]. One seems to catch the personal note of bitterness, grieving over unrealized hopes and shattered ambitions.’ In the period Bacon was exchanging letters with his private secretary and Rosicrucian Brother Sir Thomas Meautys he was also very busy revising, amending and correcting the Second Folio of the Shakespeare Works.

The second edition of the Shakespeare plays was printed by Thomas Cotes who took over the printing business of the printers of the First Folio William (d.1623) and Isaac Jaggard (d. 1627) on 29 June 1627 after acquiring the business and copyrights from his widow Dorothy Jaggard. At the time of Bacon’s supposed death in April 1626 the Jaggards (Elizabeth, wife of John Jaggard, and William and Isaac Jaggard) owned the copyright to Bacon’s *Essays* and part of the copyright to the Shakespeare First Folio. William Jaggard, who printed at least one of the several editions of Bacon’s *Essays* published by his brother John Jaggard, had taken on Thomas Cotes as an apprentice in 1597. Cotes printed Bacon’s *Certaine Considerations touching the better pacification and Edification of the Church of England* in 1604, and he and the Jaggards, enjoyed a private and professional relationship with Bacon until his feigned death in 1626. By the end of the decade Thomas Cotes had secured all the rights owned by the Jaggards and Thomas Pavier, with Robert Allot acquiring the rights to sixteen plays formerly held by Edward Blount, the publisher of the First Folio. Not long after the First Folio was issued in November or December 1623 Elizabeth Jaggard published *The Essayes of S’ Francis Bacon* sometime in 1624. The third and final edition of Bacon’s *Essays* in his known lifetime was issued in 1625 printed by John Haviland for Hanna Barret (& Richard Whitaker) that resulted in a court case brought by Elizabeth Jaggard over copyright, which she succeeded in winning. The 1625 edition was followed four years later by *The Essayes Or Covnsels, Civill And Morall of Francis Lo. Verulam, Viscounct S’. Alban* printed by John Haviland for Robert Allot the largest publisher of the Second Folio of the Shakespeare Works.
In addition to Allot the Second Folio was printed by Thomas Cotes for four others who formed part of the syndicate, two of whom William Aspley and John Smethwick held rights to plays published in the Shakespeare First Folio, together with Richard Hawkins and Richard Meighen. The copies printed for each of the five publishers had their own distinctive title page with their name alone entered in the imprint. There are five variants with the Allot imprint and one each respectively for Aspley, Smethwick, Hawkins and Meighen.\textsuperscript{195}

The preliminaries of the Second Folio reprints from the First Folio the dedication to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, Grand Master of England, and his brother Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, the address in the names of Heminges and Condell, Ben Jonson’s verses, and the poems by Leonard Digges and Hugh Holland. To this it adds John Milton’s first published poem entitled ‘An Epitaph on the Admirable Poet W. Shakespeare’ and above it an unsigned poem ‘Vpon the Effigies of my worthy Friend, the Author Master William Shakespeare, and his Workes’. Furthermore the Second Folio contains another poem not found in the First Folio which for four hundred years has remained virtually unknown to the rest of the world entitled ‘On Worthy Master Shakespeare and his Poems’ signed ‘The friendly admirer of his Endowments. J.M.S.’ This is a very special poem: ‘The quality of the poem’ writes the Shakespeare scholar Oscar James Campbell ‘is of such high order as to suggest a poet of the first rank.’\textsuperscript{196} He is certainly correct. The poem is written by the supreme master poet himself.

The first thing to notice about this long poem is the Freemasonic language of its title ‘On Worthy Master Shakespeare’ indicating that the true Shakespeare is a member of the Freemasonry Brotherhood. In modern terms a worthy Freemason can find himself elevated to the position of Worshipful Master of the Lodge who wears a Masonic Hat (most portraits of Bacon show him wearing his Master’s Hat) to signify his rank and status. In Bacon’s case it was to signify to the initiated he was Grand Master of all Freemasons whose works, including his Shakespeare plays, are replete with Masonic frontispieces, dedications, addresses and symbols, all couched in Masonic language, who in one line from the poem ‘Creates and rules a world, and workes upon/Mankind by secret engines’. It will be noticed that the first line within the large capital A has 33 italic letters: 33 Bacon in simple cipher and that the first paragraph break comes after 39 lines: 39 F. Bacon in simple cipher. The anonymous poem is signed ‘The friendly admirer of his Endowments’ comprising 33 letters: 33 Bacon in simple cipher. This is followed with 3 cryptic initials ‘I. M. S.’. In the 24 letter Elizabethan alphabet (I and J and U and V are interchangeable. The letters I (9), M (12), S (18), have a numerical value of 39 F. Bacon in simple cipher:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccc}
\end{array}
\]

\[
B & A & C & O & N \\
2 & 1 & 3 & 14 & 13=33
\]

\[
F & B & A & C & O & N \\
6 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 14 & 13=39
\]
Unlike the Shakespeare First Folio which is the primary focus of orthodox scholars and those interested in the true authorship of the Shakespeare works which has been forensically scrutinised from almost every conceivable perspective, comparatively the Second Shakespeare Folio has attracted very little critical attention, and what attention it has received, little of it has entered into the mainstream of the Shakespearean canon.
Following its publication in 1632 for the next three hundred years the vast majority of Shakespeare editors and scholars repeatedly misinformed their learned readership that it was merely a reprint of the First Folio. It was still possible for the distinguished and celebrated Henrietta C. Bartlett in her work *Mr. William Shakespeare Original and Early Editions of his Quartos and Folios* (Yale University Press) in 1922 to say of the Second Shakespeare Folio: ‘This is merely a reprint of the First Folio, 1623, and has no new readings which are of interest to the scholar.’ Similarly Professor Sir Sidney Lee at the time widely regarded as the greatest living authority on Shakespeare in his *Life of William Shakespeare* (1925) states ‘The Second Folio was reprinted from the First; a few corrections were made in the text, but most of the changes were arbitrary and needless, and prove the editor’s incompetence,’ which only served to expose and confirm his own ignorance and incompetence. Matters at the very least began to move in the right direction with Professor Pollard in his *Shakespeare Folios And Quartos* with the recognition ‘it was in 1632 that a start was made in re-editing the First Folio, and thus no survey of the history of Shakespeare’s text can be complete which does not take into account the work of these anonymous compositors and correctors.’ The fullest and most detailed summary thus far came from Professor Allardyce Nicoll who believed that there were several correctors at work including the printer who may have been responsible for the syntactical changes that abound in the Second Folio. He also pointed out that metrical alterations run through much of the 1632 edition ‘several of them exceedingly felicitous’ with the syntactical and metrical changes made for the ‘purpose of elucidating the sense…and for the purpose of making clearer the actions of the characters on the stage.’ Many of the plays in the Folio he correctly observes ‘have been carefully worked over, and we note a tendency to pay particular attention to stage directions and to classical names and references.’ Besides the printer he concludes three separate men carefully examined the comedies one of whom he states ‘was a student of both Latin and Greek, a man moreover with a considerable sense of the fitness of things’, pointedly adding ‘this man, anonymous as he is, must be regarded as Shakespeare’s first editor.’

It was however only when M.W. Black and M.A Shaaber in their truly monumental *Shakespeare’s Seventeenth-Century Editors 1632-1685* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937) subjected the First and Second Folios to a detailed comparative analysis, did the true enormity of the differences between them finally begin to emerge into the light of day. According to Black and Shaaber there are 1,679 changes in the Second Shakespeare Folio in what was an attempt to clarify, correct and improve the text:

They are fairly evenly distributed among the categories of thought, action, etc. Alterations of grammar are most numerous (459) and changes pertaining to the action least (130). Changes affecting the thought, meter, and style are very nearly equal in number-374, 359 and 357 respectively….  
…We have also collected here a number of passages in which the editor corrected inconsistencies of fact and circumstance by closely following the action of the play….  
…The changes pertaining to the action of the plays are nearly all indications of entrances and exits and reassignments of speeches….the most noteworthy accomplishment of the editor in this department is his care in marking a character’s entering or leaving the stage. Seventy-three entrances and exits are correctly added and one is correctly omitted….  
…The changes affecting the meter are among the most remarkable features of the work of the editor…There are 360 of them in F2….  
…There are a few passages in which he converted prose into verse. It may be noticed, too, that in some of the changes in our other categories care is taken not to spoil the rhythm in making
the change. Occasionally for instance, when a change affecting the thought or the style robs
the line of a syllable, the editor will insert a compensating syllable elsewhere in the line.

…The changes which we classify under the heading of style have to do chiefly with matters
of taste and propriety, the choice and the form of words. The chief matters of taste concerned
are the preference of one word or form to another and the order of the words…the editor of F2,
who was not in the least deterred by the scruples which forbid modern editors to alter the text
unless they think they are restoring what Shakespeare wrote, evidently had definite ideas
about certain matters of usage which, in justice to him, must be called intelligible.…

…The rectifications of the orthography of scraps of foreign languages in the plays and of
proper names are also interesting and sometimes clever. The editor’s Latin was evidently
good, good enough, at least, to recover quotations from Mantuan, Ovid, Virgil and Horace
..his Italian and French less good, though he made some partial corrections in these languages
too…201

The very suggestion that the enormous 1,679 amendments, revisions, corrections and
improvements concerning the dramatic action, stage-craft, metre, verse, language and
style in the Second Shakespeare Folio were executed by a combination of the printer,
anonymous compositors and correctors or some unknown editor is simply absurd. Not
only would these imagined individuals needed to have been classical scholars and
linguists (Greek, Latin, French, and Italian-languages familiar to Bacon) they would
have had to possess a necessary sophisticated comprehension of English grammar and
syntax. They would also have needed to possess a practiced and superior literary skill
to write and rewrite lines and exercise stylistic preferences. The printer, compositors,
correctors, or the editor (or any combination thereof) would also have needed to have
been seasoned poets and dramatists and have professional and practical experience of
the theatre to equip them with the knowledge and skills to introduce the appropriate
speech prefixes and various stage-directions. Perhaps most importantly, the revisions,
corrections and improvements required the unnamed and unidentified individuals to
inhabit the very structure and architecture of the plays as well as possess an intimate
familiarity with their fictive world, the kind of course, known and understood by the
author himself, the very person responsible for them. He was even thoughtful enough
to leave a calling card. All we had to do was open our minds and our eyes.

There are several variants of the title page of the Second Shakespeare Folio of which
I have taken one at random to reveal its secret Baconian-Rosicrucian ciphers. The title
page is made up of three parts, a top section, a middle section boasting the Droeshout
portrait, and a bottom section. In the top section there is a total number of 111 letters
above the portrait: 111 Bacon in kay cipher. It will also be seen that it contains 8 non-
block roman words and 3 italic words: 111-11=100 Francis Bacon in simple cipher
and 111 letters minus the 8 non-block roman words: 111-8=103 Shakespeare in
simple cipher. In the bottom section of the page, not including the block italic word
‘LONDON’, there are 29 words and four digits in the date 29+4=33 Bacon in simple
cipher which added to the 6 letters in ‘LONDON’ 33+6=39 F. Bacon in simple cipher.
Furthermore the 21 roman words and the addition of the date: 1+6+3+2=12: 21+12=
33 Bacon in simple cipher. In total the bottom section contains 132 letters which plus
the Droeshout portrait 132+1=133, a double simple cipher for Francis Bacon (100)/
Bacon (33). The whole page contains 170 roman letters, 12 italic words, and a single
portrait: 170-12-1=157 Fra Rosicrosse in simple cipher.
Fig. 3 Title page of the 2nd Shakespeare Folio 1632
**SIMPLE CIPHER:**

```
A B C D E F G H I K L M N O P Q R S T U W X Y Z
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
B A C O N F B A C O N F R A N C I S B A C O N
2 1 3 14 13=33 6 2 1 3 14 13=39 6 17 1 3 9 18 2 1 3 14 13=100

S H A K E S P E A R E F R A R O S I C R O S S E
18 8 1 10 5 18 15 5 1 17 5=103 6 1 17 14 18 9 3 17 14 18 18
S H A K E S P E A R E P E A R E
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
B A C O N
28 27 29 14 13=111
```

**KAY CIPHER:**

```
K L M N O P Q R S T U W X Y Z A B C D E F G H I
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
B A C O N
28 27 29 14 13=111
```

As well as preparing the French edition of his *Sylva Sylvarum* with the first ever *Life* of Bacon (or autobiography) published at Paris in 1631 Bacon appears to have been in direct or indirect regular contact with the French translator Jean Baudo (1590-1650) who translated a number of his works into French during the 1630s and 1640s. Their obscured relationship stretched back to before 1619 when Baudo translated Bacon’s *Essays* into French as *Les Essays Politiques Et Moraux De Messire Francois Bacon Grand Chancellor d’Angleterre* followed by further editions in 1621 and 1622 (with a new title page) all of them published at Paris. In 1626 the year Bacon supposedly died Baudo published a collection of his writings *Memoriae Sacrvm. Les Oeuvres Morales Et Politiques De Messire Francosi* containing translations of his *Essays, The Wisdom of the Ancients* and *Apophthegms*. The edition is furnished with a portrait of Bacon by Crisp Van Pass. Underneath the portrait of Bacon is a frame containing a verse with 27 words and 12 letters in block italics producing a count of 39 F. Bacon in simple cipher and 103 ordinary italics letters: 103 the numerical value of Shakespeare in simple cipher. Further editions of *Les Oeuvres Morales Et Politiques De Messire Francois Bacon* were published in 1633, 1636, 1637 and 1639, followed by an edition of *L’Artisan de la fortune* in 1640. In 1638 Baudo published a very curious work on emblems entitled *Recviel D’Emblemes* where in the preface he states:

The great Chancellor, Bacon, having awakened in me the desire of working at these emblems, has Furnished me the principal ones which I have drawn from the ingenious explanation that he has given of some fables, and from his other works [my block capitals].

Two decades earlier ‘probably issued as a second part’ to *Essays Politiques* Baudo translated Bacon’s *Wisdom of the Ancients* as *La Sagesse Mysterivse Des Anciens* published at Paris in 1619. Three years after setting forth the *Recviel D’Emblemes* for which Bacon furnished him with the principal ones Baudo published a new edition of *La Sagesse Mysterivse Des Anciens* in 1641 with an important frontispiece little known outside of specialist Baconian scholars. The frontispiece depicts Pallas Athena the goddess of knowledge and wisdom brandishing or shaking a spear, hence Bacon’s *nom de plume* Shake-speare. Above her head on which she is seen wearing her helmet of invisibility and on her shield of truth appear two mottoes ‘*Obscuris vera involvens*’ (‘Truth is enveloped in obscurity’) and ‘*Sic fulget in umbras*’ (‘Thus it shines in the shadows’).
Ord. W
(Not blocked GRAVEUR BACON)

Ord. L
(Not blocked GRAVEUR BACON)

Block L
7  5
5  5
6  6
6  5

12 27

103 ordinary letters
103 Shakespeare in simple cipher

Fig 4 Frontispiece from *Oeuvres Morales* 1626
Fig. 5 The frontispiece of Bacon’s *La Sagesse Mysterieuse (The Wisdom of the Ancients)* 1641
In 1640 appeared *Of The Advancement of Learning or the Partition of Sciences IX Bookes Written in Latin by the Most Eminent Illustrious & Famous Lord Francis Bacon Baron of Verulam Vicount of S’ Alban Counsellor of Estate and Lord Chancellor of England Interpreted by Gilbert Wats* that some Baconian scholars have correctly suggested was prepared and edited by Bacon himself. Prefixed to the 1640 edition is an engraving by W. Marshall of Bacon wearing his Masonic Hat seated at a table with pen in his hand composing the six books of *Instauratio Magna (The Great Instauration)* with Books I and II to his left and the other volumes III to VI placed on the shelf above him. Adjacent to the portrait of Bacon is an engraved frontispiece that is framed by two Masonic Pillars which as Alfred Dodd (himself a Freemason) points out:

…indicates quite clearly his connection with Modern Freemasonry by Signs and Symbols. There are the Two Great Pillars, the Terrestrial and Celestial Globes, the Sun and Moon, the Curtain, which still veils the floor of the Lodge in many old Lodges, the secret grip of the Clasped Hands, the Pyramids of the Higher Degrees, the lighted candles and the symbolic Owls that denote Wisdom and SECRETS.

The Six Parts of *The Great Instauration* are to be seen, [as] Francis Bacon’s complete work, three parts being placed under the Visible Globe and three under the Invisible Globe, thus indicating that Three were written OPENLY and Three SECRETLY: His concealed Works were *The Shake-speare Plays, the Rosicrucian Manifestos* and *The Complete Rituals* on which he founded the Masonic Brotherhood.

Prefixed to this translation of the Latin *De Augmentis Scientiarum* is a dedication signed by the obscure Gilbert Wats and includes an unsigned address described by Woodward as ‘a new and long preface by St Alban’. It is also curiously printed a number of ‘Testimonies To The Merits Of The Incomparable Philosopher S’ Francis Bacon’, among them a passage from the 1631 *Life of Bacon* said to have been written by ‘Pierre D’Ambois’, and the fulsome eulogy of Bacon by Sir Tobie Matthew taken from preface to his Italian translation of Bacon’s *Essays*. The volume also provided for the first time in English a detailed explanation and illustration of his famous bi-literal cipher which the American Elizabeth Wells Gallup would afterward discover secretly inserted in a range of Elizabethan literature including Bacon’s acknowledged writings and his Shakespeare works, confirming their true authorship.

His invisible Rosicrucian Brotherhood were also busy working behind the scenes on the first full-length work in English on cryptography entitled *Mercury, Or The Secret and Swift Messenger* issued in 1641 attributed to the Bacon disciple and Rosicrucian Brother Dr John Wilkins, one of the key founders of the Baconian-Rosicrucian Royal Society. The work is dedicated to George, Lord Berkeley (1601-1658), son of Sir Thomas Berkeley and Elizabeth Carey, the daughter of George Carey, second Baron Hunsdon patron of the Lord Chamberlain’s Men to whom Bacon supplied many of his Shakespeare plays. It is prefaced by a series of dedicatory verses. One is addressed ‘To Mercury the elder, On the most learned Mercury the younger’ signed by the poet, translator and lawyer Sir Francis Kynaston (1586/7-1642), the founder of a Baconian Academy of Learning in 1635 at whose opening Kynaston presented a masque he had written before Prince Charles, the Duke of York, and other dignitaries entitled *Corona Minerva* printed later that year. It is followed by very curious verse addressed ‘To the unknown Author’ in the name of Anthony Aucher, Esquire ‘By hiding who thou art, seek not to miss;/The Glory due to such a work as this;/But set thy name, that thou
Fig. 6 The frontispiece of Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* 1640
Fig. 7 The Title page of Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* 1640
mayst have the praise./Lest to the unknown God we Altars raise.’ In his biography Sir Francis Bacon Poet-Philosopher-Statesman-Lawyer-Wit Woodward maintained the work had been ‘fathered upon Wilkins’, and in reality it was written by Bacon, whose famous bi-literal-cipher is also set out in Mercury, Or The Swift Messenger.

As a member of Bacon’s Rosicrucian Brotherhood Dr Wilkins was privy to many of the secrets of his life and writings. In the Mathematicall Magick (1648) in a chapter discussing subterraneous lamps, its author makes the following remarkable statement:

Such a lamp is likewise related to be seen in the sepulchre of Francis Rosicosse, as is more largely expressed in the confession of that fraternity.

The passage contains a deliberate error a device used by the Rosicrucian Brotherhood when disclosing a secret about Francis Bacon. The sepulchre with the lamp in its vault is described not in the Confessio Fraternitatis, but in the preceding first Rosicrucian manifesto, the Fama Fraternitatis with the passage cryptically indicating that Francis Bacon (‘Francis Rosicosse’) was the secret founder of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood and the secret author of its two manifestos.

Four years later saw the publication of the English translation of the Fama and the Confessio delivered under the pseudonym of Eugenius Philalethes used by Hermetic philosopher Thomas Vaughan (1621-66). English translations of the two Rosicrucian manifestos had been circulating in manuscript for several decades. Thomas Vaughan (if it be him) states in the address that he was following a translation by an ‘unknown hand’ before further adding ‘The Copy was communicated to me by a Gentleman more learned then my selfe, and I should name him here, but that he expects not either thy thanks or mine.’ In his introduction to The Fame and Confession F. N. Pryce illustrates that the printed translation corresponds closely to a manuscript translation in a Scots dialect preserved among the papers of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres dated 1633. Based on textual evidence Pryce believed both the Crawford manuscript and the manuscript copy used in the 1652 edition descended from a common ancestor itself but a copy, and not the original draft of the translation, dating from well before 1633, and probably before 1630. In the address to the 1652 edition its author wishes the reader the full benefit of the work which can be gained with ‘clear eyes’ and says ‘It is not Opinion makes Things False or True: for men have deny’d a great part of the World, which now they inhabit: and America’ [the first permanent English speaking settlement was established by Bacon and his Brotherhood at Jamestown, Virginia] ‘as well as the Philosophers Stone, was sometimes in the Predicament of Impossibilities.’

There is nothing more absurd, then to be of the same mind with the Generality of Men, for they have entertain’d many gross Errors, which Time and Experience have confuted. It is indeed our Sluggishness and Incredulity that hinder all Discoveries, for men contribute nothing towards them but their Contempt, or, which is worst, their Malice. I haue known all this my self, and therefore I tell it thee: but what use thou wilt make of it, I know not. To make thee what Man should be, is not in my power, but it is much in thy own, if thou know’st thy Duty to thy self. Think of it, and Farewell.

In his biography Francis Bacon’s Personal Life-Story the learned Freemason Alfred Dodd reproduces the title page of the 1652 edition of The Fame and Confession of the Fraternity of the Rosie Cross and deciphers the secret message concealed within it:
If a line be drawn from A in “Fame” to the corner of the left hand page—i.e. from the top line to the bottom—the letters on the left side spell in Cypher, “Frater Francis Bacon.”

The Baconian-Rosicrucian Brotherhood were very active on many different fronts during the 1650s with the publication of *The Fame and Confession of the Rosie Cross* and other Rosicrucian publications much of it organised and directed at their secret meetings at Oxford and London which eventually publicly emerged into the founding of the Rosicrucian Royal Society. By the beginning of the next decade a very special work was in the process of being prepared, written, revised, and published, that is still little known to the world at large and the full implications of it still not understood to the present day. It first appeared in the early part of 1662 with the extraordinary long title of *The Holy Guide: Leading the Way to the Wonder of the World: (A Compleat Phisitian) teaching the Knowledge of all things, Past, Present, and to Come; viz. Of Pleasure, long Life, Health, Youth, Blessedness, Wisdome and Virtue; and to Cure, Change and Remedy all Diseases in Young and Old. With Rosie Crucian Medicines, which are verified by a Practical Examination of Principles in the great World.* The
work is printed in the name of the Rosicrucian apologist John Heydon (1629, d. in or after 1670) which is somewhat misleading as this collection of Rosicrucian writings commences with a very special work written by the Supreme Head of the Rosicrucian Fraternity, Lord Bacon. In the dedication to Sir Richard Temple its author written in a style heavily reminiscent of Bacon speaks of how ordinary men seek after fame and riches ‘to seem great in the eyes of the world’. Only the worthy who seek will find the place that has been unknown for a long time and which ‘is hidden from the greatest part of the world.’ In echoing the Latin inscription around the emblem of Father Time on the title page of the New Atlantis (‘In Time the Hidden Truth Shall Be Revealed’) he repeats from the Scripture ‘there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hidden that shall not be known’ (Luke 12:2). Being a servant of God and ‘Secretary of Nature, we do declare the will of God to the World’ which, he says, referring to other Rosicrucian publications including their manifestos ‘we have already performed and published in Italy and England’. Immediately following the dedication reproduced in this very rare and curious volume by way of a preface is a close adaptation of Lord Bacon’s New Atlantis set forth under the auspices of his Rosicrucian Brotherhood. It would appear that its method of delivery was designed for it to pass quietly into the sleepy world. And so it did. It would be left to the American scholar F. W. C. Wigston more than two hundred years later to make known in his Bacon Shakespeare and The Rosicrucians that the tract known as The Land of the Rosicrucians presented in The Holy Guide is none other than Bacon’s New Atlantis. The difference being this: what is left latent in New Atlantis is made manifest in Land of the Rosicrucians. In the New Atlantis where Bacon speaks of one of the wise men of the House of Solomon this is changed to ‘one of the wise Men of the Society of the Rosie Crucians’. These type of changes occur throughout the text confirming that Bacon’s New Atlantis and The Land of the Rosicrucians are one and the same, from which I will provide two more examples:

**NEW ATLANTIS**

Yee shall understand, (my deare Friends,) that amongst the Excellent Acts of that King, one above all hath preheminence. It was the Erection, and Institution of an Order, or Society, which wee call Salomon’s House; The Noblest Foundation, (as wee thinke,) that ever was upon the Earth: And the Lanthorne of this Kingdome.  

And take all an Oath of Secrecy for the Concealing of those which wee thinke fitt to keepe Secrett: Though some of those we doe reveale sometimes to the State, and some not. For our Ordinances and Rites: Wee have two very Long, and Faire Galleries…

**LAND OF THE ROSICRUCIANS**

Ye shall understand, (my dear friends,) that amongst the excellent acts of that King, one above all hath the preheminence, It was the Erection and institution of an Order, or Society, which we call The Temple of the Rosie Crosse; The noblest Foundation, (as we think,) that ever was upon the earth; And the Lanthorne of this Kingdome.

And take all an Oath of Secrecy, for the concealing of those which we think fit to keep secret: Though some of those we doe reveale sometimes to the State, and some not. Read our Temple of Wisdom: For our Ordinances and Rites: We have two very long and faire Galleries in the Temple of the Rosie Crosse…

Immediately following the reproduction of New Atlantis/Land of the Rosicrucians is what appears to be a very curious and critically important fragment of autobiography from our Rosicrucian philosopher John Heydon. But all is not what it seems. After some three pages we are met with a strikingly anomalous passage which begins with
the line that ‘I was twenty when this book was finished’ which should have struck an attentive reader as somewhat odd. John Heydon was born in 1629 and at the time of the publication of The Holy Guide he was 33 years old. We have moreover just seen that the first work in the collection was not written by Heydon but is self-evidently a version of Bacon’s New Atlantis, maybe even the original version, that he wrote when he was twenty, but could not be published in that form, when alive to the world. What follows this opening statement is clearly not the words of a thirty-three year old man, but one who is much older, near the end of his days and looking back over his life. The passage did not pass the keen-eyed attention of Constance M. Pott, who at the time of writing, probably knew Bacon’s works better than anyone else then alive: ‘few who have read much of Bacon will fail to recognise his sentiments, his intentions,-nay his very words’;

I was twenty when this book was finished, but me thinks I have outlived myself, begin to be weary of the Sun… I have shaken hands with delight and know all is vanity, and I think no man can live well once, but he that could live twice, yet for my own part I would not live over my howres past, or begin again the minutes of my days, not because I have lived them well, but for fear I should live them worse; at my death I mean to take a total adieu of the world, not caring for the burthen of a Tombstone and Epitaph, nor so much as the bare memory of my name to be found anywhere, but in the universall Register of God.

I ’gin to grow weary of the sun

[Macbeth: 5:5: 47]

For Cassius is aweary of the world

[Julius Caesar: 4:2:149]

For half-a-century Bacon’s close friend and Rosicrucian Brother Inigo Jones (1573-1652) had not been out of high Masonic office serving as Grand Master and Deputy-Grand Master of England. He died in 1652 and following the Restoration of Charles II he was succeeded as Grand Master of England in 1660 by Bacon’s kinsman Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans (1605-84), appointing Sir John Denham, his Deputy Grand Master, who about the same time was elected one of the first Fellows of the Baconian-Rosicrucian-Freemasonic Royal Society.

the Lodges…approv’d their choice of
HENRY JERMYN Earl of St. Albans as their Grand Master, who appointed Sir JOHN DENHAM his Deputy Grand Master…

In his brilliant full-length biography Henry Jermyn Stuart Spymaster and Architect of the British Empire, about whom very little was previously known, its author Anthony Adolph, who suggests Bacon might have been his early mentor, states that Jermyn chose his title, partly in memory of his kinsman and hero, Bacon who he worshipped until his dying day:

Before he left Colombes, Charles had signified his renewed confidence in Jermyn by granting him an earldom. Jermyn chose the title of the Earl of St Albans.

Jermyn chose this partly in memory of his kinsman Francis Bacon, who had been Viscount St Albans…
The Baconian-Rosicrucian Royal Society with its large number of Freemasons was publicly formed by a group of twelve men on 28 November 1660. It included William Brouncker, its first president, Dr John Wilkins, its first secretary, the great architect and future Grand Master of England Christopher, the celebrated chemist Robert Boyle and natural Rosicrucian philosopher and Baconian disciple Sir Kenelm Digby. From 1660 the home of the Royal Society was at Gresham College founded by Sir Thomas Gresham brother-in-law of Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon, whose illegitimate daughter Anne Gresham Bacon married his son Nathaniel, who was educated by Lady Bacon at Gorhambury, alongside Francis and Anthony Bacon.231 Following the fire of London the Royal Society took up temporary residence in Arundel House in 1665 for a period of around eight years, 232 the grand London town-house previously owned by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, at whose Highgate house Bacon was said to have died.

In 1667 the official account of its obscure origins was published by Thomas Sprat as The History of the Royal Society with a very important and revealing frontispiece. At its centre is a bust of King Charles II, with William Brouncker, its first president to his right, and on his left its true founder Bacon the Supreme Head of the Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood. Its prime mover Lord Bacon is sitting under the prominent winged angel holding a trumpet, alluding to his first Rosicrucian manifesto the Fama Fraternitatis which concludes with ‘Sub Umbra Alarum Tuarum Jehova’ (‘under the shadow of Jehova’s wings’):

The first impression is the Masonic pavement in the forefront of the picture. It pushes towards the viewer so that it cannot be ignored. All Masons are told about the black and white chequered floor of the lodge room…

The compasses and squares, of which there are four compasses and three squares in the plate, are described in Masonic ritual as follows: ‘The compasses and square, when united regulate our lives and our actions. The compasses belong to the Grand Master in particular and the square to the whole craft.’…

Finally there is the positioning of the three figures. The seating of the officers of a lodge of Freemasons is very carefully controlled. Charles is placed as the Grand Master in the East, with the light of the rising sun behind him. Brouncker is placed in the seat of the senior working officer while Bacon is placed in the seat of the immediate Past Master.

…Bacon…is [also] shown in the frontispiece…wearing the jewel and collar of a Chaplain of the Lodge of Edinburgh.233

Prefixed to the volume is a long and important verse by Abraham Cowley dedicated ‘To the Royal Society’, that in reality is penned in praise of Bacon, in which Cowley alludes to Bacon as the supreme poet and dramatist Shakespeare ‘With the Desserts of Poetry they fed him’ and ‘They chose his Eye to entertain(His curious but not covetous Eye)/ With painted Scenes, and Pageants of the Brain’:

Bacon at last, a mighty Man arose,
Whom a wise King and Nature chose
Lord Chancellour of both their Laws,
And boldly undertook the injur’d Pupils caus.

Bacon, like Moses, led us forth at last,
The barren Wilderness he past,
Did on the very Border stand
Of the blest promis’d Land,
And from the Mountains Top of his Exalted Wit,
Saw it himself, and shew’d us it.234

60
Fig. 9 The frontispiece to The History of the Royal Society 1667
With the first official historian of the Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Royal Society leaving no room for doubt that its prime mover and great moving spirit was Lord Bacon from whom it all originated:

I shall onely mention one great Man, who had the true Imagination of the whole extent of this Enterprize, as it is now set on foot; and that is, the Lord Bacon. In whose Books there are every where scattered the best arguments, that can be produc’d for the defence of Experimental Philosophy; and the best directions, that are needful to promote it. All which he has already adorn’d with so much Art; that if my desires could have prevail’d with some excellent Friends of mine, who engag’d me to this Work: there should have been no other Preface to the History of the Royal Society, but some of his Writings.

The founder of the Francis Bacon Society Constance M. Pott, the first to explore the question of when did Lord Bacon actually die and where was he buried, had a twelve year correspondence with Dr Kirsch, a member of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood. In their series of letters Pott repeatedly stated her belief that Lord Bacon did not die in 1626, he only died to the world, and lived to a great age. Following long research and collation of old works and their new revised and enlarged editions post 1626, which she believed were carried out by Bacon, she very strongly suspected that he lived to at least 1662, and perhaps even longer. Her correspondent Dr Kirsch informed her that she had discovered “the capital secret” of Rosicrucianism:

[He] then stated as an absolute matter of fact that Francis St. Alban lived to the age of 106- (that is the age assigned to the Rosicrucian Father). He died in 1668 in full possession of his faculties, having for forty years after his supposed death continued to produce a mass of literature…

It is believed that shortly after his feigned death Bacon secretly slipped away to the continent first to spend time in Paris and France then likely travelling to The Hague in Holland, both centres of Rosicrucian activity, before eventually settling in Germany where he lived for many years with the Andreae family, at whose head stood Johann Valentin Andreae (1586-1654). For several centuries it was wrongly believed that he was the founder of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood and the concealed author of their first two manifestos the Fama Fraternitatis and Confessio Fraternitatis as well as the third Rosicrucian document The Chemical Wedding. Nevertheless, he was certainly closely associated with the Rosicrucian Brotherhood and its movement and several scholars including Professor Speckman have attempted to trace links post 1626 between Bacon and Andreae. In the first half of the last century Bertram G. Theobald conducted a correspondence for some time with Herr Conrad Andreae of Frankfurt-on-Main, who was a direct descendent of Johann Valentin Andreae, from whom he received several photographs of pictures which had passed down numerous generations of the Andreae family. Two of the photographs were reproduced in an edition of Baconiana. The first of these depicts Andreae at forty-two years old and a second portrait published on the title page of the re-edition of The Christian Herculie apparently depicts Andreae in old age. In her article ‘The Two Deaths Of Francis Bacon’ Mabel Sennett pointedly asks ‘Are these two portraits of the same person?’ There is also a more well-known portrait supposedly of Andreae that is employed as the frontispiece to the Rosicrucian Bibliography (Bibliotheca Rosicruciana) adorned with some very curious symbols. On the top left hand side of the portrait as we look at is a winged helmet. In his essay Of Delay Bacon says ‘the helmet of Pluto, which maketh the politic man go invisible, is secrecy in the counsel and celerity in the execution. For when things are once come
Fig. 10 Three portraits of Johann Valentin Andreae (with the last believed to be Francis Bacon)
to the execution, there is no secrecy comparable to celerity; like the motion of a bullet in the air, which flieth so swift as it outruns the eye."241 In his Promus of Formularies and Elegances (private note-book) containing 1655 entries, several hundred of which find a correspondence throughout his Shakespeare plays, is the entry ‘Plutoes helmet. Invisibility’.242 This is expanded upon in The Wisdom of the Ancients ‘ wherein Bacon says Perseus ‘received swiftness from Mercury, secrecy of counsel from Pluto, and providence from Pallas.’243 It was from Pallas Athena, the goddess of knowledge and wisdom, depicted as holding or shaking a spear, that Bacon derived his nom de plume Shakespeare. In his De Augmentis Scientiarum Bacon links the helmet of Pluto ‘used to render men invisible’ to the ‘mirror of Pallas’, representing foresight ‘as to leave as little as possible to fortune.’244 As part of the winged helmet in the portrait appears the two crosses of St Andrew which are mirrored in the top right side by another cross of St Andrew (giving us 3 visible crosses concealing three invisible crosses 33 Bacon in simple cipher). The St Andrews Cross is the same or mirrored in the St Alban’s Cross with its yellow satire on a blue field originally used by the Abbey of St Albans and is the corporate seal and heraldic emblem of St Albans. It is also found in the flags of St Albans Cathedral and the city of St Albans, Hertfordshire. According to the central legend of Freemasonry the Craft was introduced into England in the time of St Alban a fictitious myth invented to conceal the true founder of the Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood, Francis Bacon created Viscount St Alban in 1621. He Andreae, writes Dodd (himself a Freemason), ‘was a Mask for someone else who used the Cross of St. Andrew in one of the Higher Masonic Degrees as a “Knight of St. Andrew” adding that ‘the Cross shows the real origin of the Continental Rosicrucian manifestos-St. Albans; and the writer Francis Bacon.’245 The descendants of Johann Valentin Andreae were also the source of another astonishing portrait that to the present day is virtually unknown outside of a very small elite circle of Baconians confirming that Bacon lived to a very old age.

Several Baconians including Kate H. Prescott, sister of Elizabeth Wells Gallup who deciphered Bacon’s bi-literary cipher in his acknowledged works and his Shakespeare plays and the Freemason and Baconian biographer Alfred Dodd were in contact with Frau von le Coq the wife of Professor von le Coq of Berlin in the first half of the last century. At the time Frau von le Coq was in regular contact with members of the Andreae family living in Frankfurt. Over a period of time she struck up a friendship with Conrad Andreae who possessed a fine library containing many surviving relics, artefacts and books relating to his illustrious ancestor Johann Valentin Andreae, a key member of Bacon’s secret Rosicrucian Brotherhood. She was granted access to some books on the genealogy of the Andreae family and came across a portrait surrounded by all the family arms. The following year Frau von Le Coq submitted a request to the Andreae family to allow her to have all the family portraits photographed. Through the good offices of Conrad Andreae and Frau von Le Coq several of the photographs of the portraits were passed to Bertram G. Theobald in which he discovered a series of Baconian ciphers. Theobald was planning to visit Germany to meet members of the Andreae family to further his investigations when the Second World War broke out. He unfortunately died a year later in September 1940.246 Prior to the World War Frau von Le Coq exchanged many private letters with the leading Baconian Alfred Dodd in which she told him ‘she was quite satisfied that she had discovered evidence in certain archives that Francis Bacon had lived in Germany after 1626 and had stayed for a long time in the Andrea family.’247 She also sent him a photograph of the portrait here produced below:
Fig. 11 A portrait of Francis Bacon as an old man
This is a remarkable photograph. It is said that Francis Bacon fled to the Continent at Easter 1626, and that he did not die but went to live with the Andrea family. Frau Von Le Coq was allowed to take this photograph by the permission of the Andrea descendants. Here we get Masonic and Rosicrucian Emblems. It is in short a Masonic Picture and the man in the centre is believed to be Francis Bacon as a very old man. The singular thing is that here we have two shields, out of the many that surround the portrait, which simply contain the letters “F.B.”

Frau Von le Coq assured me that the Andrea possessors of the picture were quite uncertain that it was a picture of Andrea and could give no explanation of what the “F.B.” stood for apart from Francis Bacon, for whom Andrea was a field-worker to propagate his secret Order.

The philosopher and Father of the Modern World Francis Bacon was born in secrecy, the eldest son of Queen Elizabeth and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and was thus the unrecognized concealed heir to the throne of England. He was the secret author of the Shakespeare poems and plays and spent most of his life secretly working for the future benefit of humanity with his invisible Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood. He was born in secrecy and died in secrecy. After his first death to the profane world Bacon lived a second secret life which has not yet been revealed to the world by his invisible Brotherhood, who closely guard and watch over the secrets of his first and second life, as well as his writings from both lives. As indicated on the title page of his New Atlantis (The Land of the Rosicrucians), the blueprint for the United States of America en route to their declared Universal Reformation of the Whole World: ‘In Time the Hidden Truth will be Revealed’. His Rosicrucian-Freemasonry Brotherhood will eventually disclose to the world where Bacon truly died and where he is actually buried and that he is the true author of the Shakespeare works, as well as other secrets about his life and writings. The full truth will truly stagger humankind.
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